INTRODUCTION TO DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

WEIDNER

Class 230.41P Book W426
General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

DR. WEIDNER'S WORKS.

Theological Encyclopædia.
Vol. 1. Exegetical Theology, 12mo., ... $1.00
Vol. 2. Historical and Systematic Theology 1.00

Biblical Theology of the Old Testament.
Second Revised edition. 1.50

Biblical Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols.
Vol. 1. The Teaching of Jesus, and of Peter 1.50
Vol. 2. The Teaching of Paul, and of John 1.50

System of Dogmatic Theology.
Vol. 1. Introduction to Dogmatic Theology.
Second Revised edition. 12mo. pp. 289. 1895.... 1.50

Examination Questions on Church History and Christian Archæology. 16mo. ..... .60

Introductory New Testament Greek Method.
One vol., 12mo., pp. 520. Fifth edition 2.50

Christian Ethics. 1891.
One vol., 12mo., pp. 418..... 2.50

Prof. Weidner has also published the following works:

Bengel's Gnomon. 3 vols., pp. 2500..... 6.00

Ball's Hebrew Grammar. 8vo., pp. 425..... 2.25

Whitehead's Commentary on John...16mo., pp. 158 ..... .60

Allen's Commentary on Acts. 16mo., pp. 172..... .60

A SYSTEM

OF

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

BASED ON LUTHARDT AND KRAUTH

BY

REVERE FRANKLIN WEIDNER, D. D., LL. D.,

Professor of Dogmatics in the Theological Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church at Chicago.

I. PROLEGOMENA

ROCK ISLAND, ILL.
AUGUSTANA BOOK CONCERN.

AN INTRODUCTION TO DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

BASED ON LUTHARDT

BY

REVERE FRANKLIN WEIDNER, D. D., LL. D.,

Professor of Theology in the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary; Author of "Biblical Theology of the Old Testament" and of the "New Testament"; "Christian Ethics"; "Theological Encyclopaedia"; "Studies in the Book"; etc.

1851-1915

LUTHERAN

SECOND EDITION REVISED

ROCK ISLAND, ILL.
AUGUSTANA BOOK CONCERN.

230.41 P
W 426

64066

Copyright, 1888,
by
Revere Franklin Weidner.

Copyright, 1895,
by
Revere Franklin Weidner.

YANKEE CONTINENTAL
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

DEDICATED

TO THE MEMORY OF

CHARLES PORTERFIELD KRAUTH,

HIS TEACHER AND FRIEND,

BY

THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

Revealed Theology naturally divides itself into four main departments, exegetical, historical, systematic, and practical. Under Exegetical Theology we comprise all the sciences that relate to the exposition and elucidation of the Holy Scriptures; Historical Theology begins with Sacred History and includes what has been developed in the Church in the shape of Church History and the History of Doctrine; Practical Theology embraces the theory of the activities of the Church, as exercised by the pastor and teacher in particular; but in Systematic Theology we have the highest form of theological science. It is the scientific and connected presentation of Christian doctrine in its relation to both faith and morals, and comprises the sciences of Apologetics, Dogmatics, and Ethics.

Our later theologians distinguish between Biblical Theology and Dogmatics. Biblical Theology has for its aim to represent the religious ideas and doctrines which are contained in the Bible, and is a purely historical discipline, and as such belongs to the department of Historical Theology. Christian Dogmatics or Dogmatic Theology, on the other hand, is a historico-philosophical science, in which the result of historical exegesis are unified and systematized. It uses the results of Biblical Theology as the material with which

it builds. It is the sum of the truths embraced in the Christian faith in their organic connection with the facts of religious truth. It is the science of that, of which the Christian affections and the Christian life are the great art. It has no other aim than the teaching of the Christian religion, as this is established in the experimental consciousness of the believer, to produce it spiritually and to bring it into a scientific, systematic form, for the delineation and development in every direction of its divinely wrought fact in Jesus Christ.

Of late, Dogmatic Theology has been somewhat neglected in certain parts of the Protestant world, and indeed has fallen into disrepute, more stress being laid upon the results of Biblical Theology. We are told that in Dogmatic Theology we have the deductions and speculations of men while in Biblical Theology we have the pure teaching of the Word of God. But let us not forget that the man who takes up the Bible now without reference to what has been done toward its elucidation in the past, and without being guided by the development of doctrine, is unwise and will fall into error, for the faith and doctrinal thinking of the present is conditioned by the intellectual labors and the development of Church doctrine in the past, and must consequently assure itself of its essential harmony with it.

This work does not present a System of Christian Theology, but is simply an *Introduction* to such a Sys-

tem. It is the door and the vestibule which leads to the sacred edifice. It only treats of the definition, contents, method, and history, of Dogmatics. The attempt has been made to give a concise and yet complete history of Dogmatics, including even a brief sketch of the most prominent recent writers in this department. The book itself is the outgrowth of work in the class-room, and has been prepared to meet the wants of my students, and is published in the hope that it may be of some service not only to other theological students, and to the English-speaking ministers of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, but may be of interest even to those who are not of the same Confession of Faith.

He who watches the horizon of German Lutheran Theology, will always discover some new star of great brilliancy, just coming into range above it. One of the latest of distinguished living conservative theologians is CHRISTOPH ERNST LUTHARDT, since 1856 professor of theology at Leipsic, and renowned as a university lecturer and pulpit orator. His *Compendium der Dogmatik* appeared in 1865, and in 1886 had already reached the seventh edition. This work is not strictly speaking the development of a system, but rather a compendious presentation of carefully selected material. It is by far the best manual of the Dogmatics of the Evangelical Lutheran Church we possess. On account of its comprehensiveness, brevity, and succintness, my own teacher, CHARLES PORTERFIELD KRAUTH, *late Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the Evangel-*

ical Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, took it as a general guide in a large part of his own lectures, and especially recommended it to his students. This work has been the basis of my own lectures during the last six years, my students using a Swedish translation of the fifth German edition. In this *Introduction* we closely follow the outline of Luthardt, but though we follow his outline and plan, it is not a translation, nor a condensation, nor simply an adaptation, but we have made an attempt to rewrite the work for the special wants of the Church in this country.

The writer would also record his great indebtedness to the Manuscript Lectures of Dr. Krauth, which have been freely used, and from which we have derived constant stimulus and suggestion. He would also express his great obligations to his venerable colleague, Dr. Hasselquist, whose rich scholarship was constantly at his command, and who, with a kindness which the writer cannot adequately acknowledge, has done him the great favor of reading the whole book aloud in his presence, during its passage through the press.

R. F. W.

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Easter Monday, April 2, 1888.
Rock Isalnd, Ill.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

The demand for a new edition of this *Introduction to Dogmatics* has given me the opportunity carefully to revise the whole, and even to rewrite parts of it. My aim has been to adapt the presentation to the wants of our Church in this country, and to aid our younger clergy and our theological students in obtaining a clearer view of the vast field occupied by the Science of Dogmatics. Special attention has been given to the literature of the subject, and the attempt has been made to bring it up to date.

It is gratifying that in this age of indifference to Creeds and to the positive teachings of the Church, there is still a demand for such works as this, and I hope many may be led to explore more fully the rich treasures of that Science to which this small handbook is but the door and vestibule.

R. F. W.

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Epiphany, 1895.
Chicago.

CONTENTS.

Sec.		Page.
1.	The Object of the Introduction	17
	I. THE DEFINITION OF DOGMATICS.	
2.	The Definition of Theology	18
	1. Usage of the word Theology	18
	2. Divisions of Theology	19
	3. Definition of Revealed Theology	20
	4. Means of Theological Study	21
	5. Aim of Theology	22
3.	The Claims of Theology	23
	1. It is a Biblical Science	23
	2. Its scientific necessity	24
	3. Its possibility	26
	4. In harmony with a genuine Philosophy	28
	5. Limitations of Theology	30
4.	The Organism of Theology	30
	1. The Departments of Theology defined	31
	2. The Relation of Dogmatics and Ethics	32
5.	The Name and Definition of Dogmatics	33
	1. The Name of the Science	33
	2. Definition of Dogma	33
	3. Definition of Dogmatics	34
	4. Relation to other Branches of Theology	37
	II. THE CONTENTS OF DOGMATICS.	
6.	The Name and Definition of Religion	39
	1. The universal fact of Religion	39
	2. The Word Religion	39
	3. Definition of Religion	40
7.	The Origin and Essential Character of Religion	41
	1. The Origin of Religion	41
	2. The Essential Character of Religion	42
8.	The Actuality and Truth of Religion	43
	1. Religion in its subjective sense	44
	2. Religion in its objective sense	46
	3. True and False Religion	46
	4. Natural and Positive Religion	51

Sec. Page.
9. Essential Character and Truth of Christianity..... 53
1. The Relation of Christianity to Heathenism and Judaism 53
2. The Essential Character of Christianity..... 54
3. The Historical Conception of Christianity..... 55
4. Christianity is the true Religion..... 56

10. The Antithesis of Romanism and Protestantism..... 56
1. False explanations of the difference..... 57
2. A general statement of the difference..... 57
3. The Essential Character of Romanism..... 58
4. Romanism criticised 59
5. The Essential Character of Protestantism..... 61

11. Lutheran Protestantism 67
1. Lutheran and Reformed Protestantism contrasted 68
2. The Material and Formal Principle..... 71
3. The Material Principle of Lutheranism..... 72
4. The Formal Principle of Lutheranism..... 74
5. The Historical Character of Lutheran Protestantism 76
6. The Internal Assurance of Salvation..... 80

III. THE METHOD OF DOGMATICS.

12. The Formation of a Dogmatic System..... 83
1. The Material Principle of Dogmatics..... 83
2. The Scriptures as the Normative factor of Dogmatics 84
3. The Canon of Scripture..... 86
4. The Interpretation of Scripture..... 93

13. The Church Doctrine and the Subjective Consciousness of Faith..... 98
1. The Churchly Character of Dogmatics..... 99
2. The Confessions of the Church..... 99
3. History of the Lutheran Confessions..... 112
4. The Church Doctrine as consisting of Articles of Faith 129
5. The Fundamental Principles of Faith of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of North America..... 137
6. The Consciousness of Faith..... 140

14. The Disposition of Dogmatics..... 141

Sec. Page.

IV. THE HISTORY OF DOGMATICS.

15. The Dogmatics of the Ancient Church 149
1. The Apostolic Fathers 150
2. The Oriental Church 151
3. The Western Church 161

16. The Dogmatics of the Middle Ages 172
1. The Essential Character of Scholasticism 172
2. The Beginnings of Scholasticism 174
3. The Period of the highest bloom of Scholasticism .. 180
4. The Period of its Decline 185
5. Mysticism and Pre-Reformatory Theology 187
6. The Humanists 191

17. The Dogmatics of the Century of the Reformation 191
1. The Dogmatics of Melanchthon 192
2. The Melanchthonian School of Dogmatics 195
3. The Reformed Dogmatics 198

18. The Orthodox Dogmatics of the Seventeenth Century 202
1. Characteristic of this Dogmatics 202
2. The divers Tendencies of this Period 205
3. The Dogmaticians of this Period 207
4. The Reformed or Calvinistic Dogmatics of this Period 216

19. The Dogmatics of the Period of Transition 228
1. The Dogmatics of Pietism 228
2. The Biblical Tendency 232
3. The Historical Tendency 235
4. The Philosophical Tendency 238
5. The History of Dogmatics outside of Germany 239

20. The Dogmatics of Rationalism and Supranaturalism .. 241
1. The Illumination, falsely so-called 241
2. Kant 245
3. Vulgar Rationalism 246
4. Supranaturalism 248

21. The Dogmatics of the Most Recent Time 252
1. The Renewal of Religious Faith 252
2. The Philosophy of this Period 252

3. The Emotional Theology of this Period..... 255
4. The Dogmatics of the Mediating Theology..... 259
5. The Dogmatics of Modern Scientific Rationalism.. 262
6. Confessional Dogmatics 264
Select Literature on Dogmatics..... 274
Examination Questions 278
Index 289

AN INTRODUCTION TO DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

§ 1 The Object of the Introduction.

In the Introduction or Prolegomena to a System of Christian Theology we treat of the Definition, the Contents, the Method, and the History of Dogmatics.

SELNECKER (d. 1592), who wrote a commentary on the "Loci" of Melanchthon (d. 1560), was the first to introduce the practice of prefacing works in Dogmatics with Prolegomena.[1] In QUENSTEDT[2] (d. 1688) there are five introductory chapters[3], and his plan is adopted by SCHMID in his "Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church verified from the original sources",[4] a work which is of invaluable aid to the English student who wishes to become acquainted with the Theology of the Lutheran Church.

[1] In his *Institutiones Christianæ Religionis.* 1563.

[2] His *Theologia didactico-polemica* appeared in 1685.

[3] 1) Of Theology in general; 2) Of Religion; 3) Of the Source of Theology; 4) Of the Holy Scriptures; 5) Of the Articles Of Faith.

[4] Translated by HAY and JACOBS. Second edition, revised according to the sixth German edition. Philadelphia, 1889.

The material of Introduction continued to enlarge. Our later Dogmaticians give special prominence to the apologetic questions concerning Religion and Revelation, Miracles and Prophecy, Holy Scripture and Canon, Inspiration and Exposition, Faith and Knowledge.[1]

I. DEFINITION OF DOGMATICS.

§ 2. Definition of Theology.

Theology may be defined as the churchly science of Christianity,[2] or the scientific self-consciousness of the Church.[3]

1. *The usage of the word.*

According to its derivation, Theology is the discourse about God and divine things. The word has been used in the church in various senses:

1) In the narrowest sense, as designating the doctrine of the Deity of Christ, or of the doctrine of the Trinity.[4]

[1] Of our Lutheran Dogmaticians, PHILIPPI (d. 1882) devotes his first volume of 346 pages to the discussion of the topics of Religion and Revelation, Faith and Doctrine, Holy Scriptures and the Canon, Inspiration and Exposition; LUTHARDT, whose system we closely follow, gives 21 out of 79 sections to his Prolegomena and History of Dogmatics; MARTENSEN (d. 1884) in 36 sections, covering 70 pages, discusses the general topics of Religion and Revelation, Christianity and the Christian Church, Catholicism and Protestantism, Theology and Holy Scripture, Church Confessions and the Christian Idea of Truth. VILMAR (d. 1868) devotes more than one sixth of his whole work to his Introduction.

The Reformed Systems of Theology, best known in this country, contain more or less elaborate Introductions, as the works of HODGE (d. 1878), SMITH (d. 1877), SHEDD, (all three Presbyterians), VAN OOSTERZEE (d. 1882, Dutch Reformed), GERHART (German Reformed), STRONG (Baptist), etc.

[2] Luthardt.

[3] Kahnis.

[4] In this sense the designation of the "theologian" was given to the Apostle John, because he treats so fully of the Godhead of the Logos, and to Gregory Nazianzen (d. 389), because of his defence of the Deity of the Logos against the Arians. In this sense the word is no longer used.

2) In a less narrow sense, as designating the doctrine concerning God, in distinction from the other parts of Dogmatic Theology.[1]

3) In a wide sense, as designating Dogmatic Theology, in distinction from Apologetics and Ethics, the other parts of Systematic Theology.

4) In a wider sense, as designating the whole science of the Christian religion, including the whole range of revealed truth.[2]

5) In the widest sense, as referring to the science of God and of the relations between God and the universe, including both natural and revealed Theology.

2. *Divisions of Theology.*

Theology may be considered 1) as *theologia archetypa* or *ectypa,* and 2) *theologia naturalis* or *revelata.*[3]

By archetypal Theology our older Dogmaticians mean that perfect knowledge which God has of himself and in himeslf (Matt. 11:27; 1 Cor. 2:10), and by ectypal theology that knowledge of God revealed to man through the Word and taught by the Holy Ghost. It is ectypal (derived), after the model of the archetypal Theology. Natural theology comprehends that knowledge of God which can be known apart from revelation, either through innate ideas, or from the contemplation of nature; revealed theology is that knowledge of God

[1] Many modern Dogmaticians (Hase, Hodge, Shedd, Vilmar) use the word in this narrow sense.

[2] Since the twlefth century, when ABELARD (1079—1142) named his manual of doctrine *Theologia Christiana.* In this sense it embraces exegetical, historical, systematic, and practical theology. This is the common usage of the word.

[3] Other distinctions may simply be referred to; as those given by the Greek philosophers: *Theologia mythica, physica, civilis* or *moralis;* as those based upon the mode of communication, *theologia acroamatica* or *esoterica, popularis* or *exoterica, catechetica. practica;* as *false* or *true.*

and divine things which God has made known in the Scriptures and through them delivered to man.

3. *Definition of Revealed Theology.*

HOLLAZ defines Theology in a twofold way: 1) In a strict sense, "Theology is that exalted practical science, revealed through God's Word, which teaches all things which sinful man, capable of eternal salvation, must know and do, in order to acquire true faith in Christ and attain holiness of life"; 2) viewed as a system, and in a secondary sense, "Theology is that doctrine or teaching drawn from the Word of God, by which men are instructed in the true faith and in a pious life unto eternal salvation."

Since the eighteenth century the word *Theology*, used without any qualifying epithet, denotes that knowledge of God and our duty to him which we derive from the supernatural revelation of God. Among the more recent churchly theologians, three diverse definitions have gained currency: 1) Theology is the science of religion;[1] 2) Theology is the churchly science of Christianity; 3) Theology is the scientific self-consciousness of the Church.

The true theologian must of necessity be a regenerate man, firmly believing the divine Word, adhering to it with unshaken confidence, apt in teaching others, and skilful in confuting opponents. Men who have never really submitted their hearts to the influence and authority of the Bible as a divine revelation, and who have never really seen God as he has made himself known in his Word, cannot with propriety be said to know Christian Theology, and are not properly entitled to the name of theologians (1 Cor. 2:14).

[1] A definition that cannot be accepted, because the science of Theology deals with objective facts entirely independent of the subjective mental processes of the theologian.

4. *The Means of Theological Study.*

Luther was accustomed to say that there were three things that were necessary to make a theologian: 1) prayer, 2) meditation, and 3) experience. "Prayer begins the study of Theology, meditation continues it, and experience confirms it."[1]

Luther places *prayer* first, because it is the imperative duty of all who desire to become acquainted with Theology, and qualified for the office of a minister of the Gospel, to abound in prayer and supplication. Our prayers become tests of our character, our motives, and our longings. If we have not those spiritual influences which are necessary to guide into all truth, and to prepare us for the work of the ministry, it is because we ask not, or ask amiss (James 4:3; 1:5).

Under the head of meditation Luther includes especially reading, learning, and reflecting upon the Word of God. It is only by your own reading and study, accompanied by the teaching of the divine Spirit, that you can become theologians. You must read, *commit*, and reflect upon, the Word of God. But Luther under this head comprehends also reading and meditation in general. Two errors are to be avoided: 1) Indiscriminate reading of whatever theological books may come in your way, and 2) mere reading, without meditation and reflection. Whether you are reading books, or listening to instructions or lectures, you must not neglect meditation, letting your mind dwell upon what you read and hear, until you can understand and comprehend it fully,— until you have so fully digested it, that it becomes a part of your own intellectual stores.

The third thing, according to Luther's enumeration,

[1] Oratio studium theologiæ inchoat, meditatio continuat, tentatio consolidat.

which aids in maknig a theologian, is temptation or experience, or the practical application of divine truth in mortifying and subduing sin in our own hearts. You can have no thorough and intimate acquaintance with divine truth, nor be able rightly to divide it, or apply it wisely and judiciously for the benefit of others, without this experience.

As Christian theology is the science of divine things, it cannot be mastered without profound study. Whether a man has really mastered his profession or not will soon be found out. They who belittle theology, perhaps because they have never studied it and thus do not know its rich contents, are simply dishonoring their profession.

There are therefore certain requisites to the successful study of theology. Among others we may mention: 1) natural endowments; 2) a disciplined mind; 3) a well-balanced mind; 4) thorough preparatory training; 5) a knowledge of the original languages of the Bible; 6) an acquaintance with mental and moral science; 7) an inward vocation; 8) a holy affection toward God; 9) spiritual mindedness; 10) professional zeal; 11) the enlightening influence of the Holy Spirit; 12) a diligent use of the *means* of theological study.

5. *The Aim of Theology.*

The final aim of theology does not lie in the science itself, still less in its students alone, but entirely and completely in the up-building of the kingdom of God in and around them, and in the glorification of God.

HOLLAZ speaks of a twofold aim, partly objective, the infinitely perfect and supremely beneficent God, and partly formal, the beatific vision and fruition of God. When in another place he speaks of the *immediate* and *ultimate* aim of theology, he identifies the aim of the

preaching of the Gospel with the aim of theology as a science: "The immediate aim of theology is true faith in Christ, and this faith operates in a two-fold way; 1) *internally*, embracing Christ with his benefits, and 2) *externally*, producing good works. The *ultimate* aim of theology is eternal happiness, which consists not only in intuitive knowledge of God, but also in the enjoyment of him."

§ 3. The Claims of Theology.

Although the Bible is not a system of theology, still God reveals to us in his Word the truths which, if properly understood and arranged, constitute the Science of Theology. Such a science is necessary to satisfy the intellect, to direct the affections, and to develop the practical life of the minister and of the Church. It is possible because God has revealed himself to man, and the relation of faith to knowledge, and of Theology to Philosophy is such, as not to preclude the possibility of a theological science.

Theology claims our regard and prayerful study:

1. *Because it is a Biblical Science.*

It has its origin in the Word of God, and is distinctly recognized in the artless yet specific language of Scripture. It calls our attention to the value of skill over against unskilfulness, of learning over against ignorance, of system over against confusion, of the mastery of knowledge over against the feebleness of a novice. And all these are the marks of a genuine theology. There is a scribe thoroughly furnished for the kingdom (Matt. 13:52), implying that there are scribes not thoroughly furnished. PAUL was, relatively, what

would now be called a great dogmatician; APOLLOS would be styled a biblical theologian; LUKE would be considered a master in historical theology. The persons here mentioned were teachers scientifically trained. Throughout the whole body of the Apostles we see the predominance of either the theoretical or practical tendency. "Although revelation does not present to us a dogmatic system ready-made, a dogmatic system is not only implicitly contained therein, but parts of the system are wrought out in the epistles of the New Testament, e. g. in Rom. 5: 12—19; 1 Cor. 15: 3, 4; 8: 6; 1 Tim. 3: 16; Heb. 6: 1, 2."[1]

The pastors, as *shepherds,* must also be *teachers,* (Eph. 4: 11); the *bishop* must be *apt to teach* (1 Tim. 3: 2; 2 Tim. 2: 24). The teacher must be a *"workman that needeth not to be ashamed, handling aright the word of truth"* (2 Tim. 2: 15), *"holding to the faithful word which is according to the teaching, that he may be able both to exhort in the sound doctrine, and to convict the gainsayers"* (Tit. 1: 9). He must be, in modern phraseology, strong in Dogmatics and Polemics.

2. *Because of its Scientific Necessity.*

The science which traces the doctrinal claims of Christianity, in their relation, their mutual dependency, and their harmonious organization, is necessary:

1) *To satisfy the intellect.* To edify is to build; building requires order, harmony, and proportion. The more perfect a religion is, the more does it tend to a scientific system. The science of theology meets the deepest want of man's rational nature. It is the grand system of the whole divine world, the Cosmos of the moral universe of God, and without it, revelation would but imperfectly fulfil its ends. If all existing theolog-

[1] Strong, *Systematic Theology,* p. 9, ed. 1886.

ical systems were destroyed to-day, new systems would arise to-morrow.

2) *To give the wisest direction to the affections.* Truth systematically presented promotes the development of Christian character. a) It enlightens the understanding with sound knowledge, so that men have clear views of truth; b) it awakens emotion through that truth and by truth strengthens and purifies emotion; c) it directs the will and conscience, by the power of that emotion, to activity in making man holy, and in impelling him to do good to others. That piety which can be injured by the systematic presentation of the great doctrines of Christianity must be weak, mystical, spurious, or mistaken (Heb. 5: 12—14).

3) *To develop perfectly the practical life of the minister, and his usefulness as a teacher of religion.* The minister must have all the knowledge which adapts him to the wants of the Church. He must know her history and practical needs, the need of the altar, the need of the pulpit, the need of the pastor, and of the people. All this can only be obtained by the diligent study of the science of theology. Nothing more certainly destroys a minister's influence for good than confusion and inconsistency in his doctrinal statements. To mutilate or to misrepresent truth is not only a sin against God, but, it may also prove the ruin of men's souls. The function of the minister is to proclaim the truth of God to men, and his first duty is to learn it; and he will be a traitor to himself and to his calling if he does not resolve, so far as he has the power, above all things, to be a *theologian.* He may be something besides, but this he must be. SPURGEON truly says: "We shall never have great preachers until we have great divines."

4) *To develop the practical life of the Church.* There is a close connection between purity of doctrine and purity of life. For a misrepresentation of the truth, or a defective understanding of the truth, sooner or later, results in defects of organization, and in errors of operation and of life. There is a foundation on which the Church rests, and other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ. The minister must know the development of the Church in faith and creed, he must be enriched by the lessons of the Church's past, for his labor in preparing the way for the Church of the future. The science of theology is necessary for the upbuilding of the Church.

3. *Because it is possible.*

Amid the conflicting systems of theology, and the warfare of pretended science against all theology, the question of Pilate more than ever arises, What is Truth? That science of theology is possible has been denied even by those who profess to feel the necessity of it and to yearn for the possession of it. SHEDD[1] maintains that the sceptical estimate of theology is unscientific, because it is founded upon a superficial knowledge of the sources and objects of the science. He proves this in the cases of the attacks made by Hume, Gibbon, Buckle, Draper, Froude, and others, and holds that theology is *absolute* science in contradistinction to relative knowledge, and that there is no science so rightly entitled to be denominated absolute, and metaphysically certain as theology. STRONG: "The possibility of theology has a three-fold ground: 1) In the existence of a God who has relations to the universe; 2) in the capacity of the human mind for knowing God and certain of

[1] *Dogmatic Theology*, Vol. 1. Pp. 19—58.

these relations; and 3) in God's actual revelation of himself and certain of those relations."

The objection, also, has been made that theology can not be regarded as a science, because the truths that are therein contained are not proper objects of knowledge, because they are to be apprehended only by faith. But faith and knowledge do not stand in such relation to each other, as to preclude the possibility of theological science. Faith is only a higher sort of knowledge. By faith we apprehend what is beyond our knowledge. The three elements of faith are knowledge, assent and confidence; the first two are acts of the intellect, and the third an act of the will.[1] This intimate coherence of faith and knowledge is constantly and expressly referred to in the Bible itself (1 Cor. 13: 12; 14: 20; 1 John 2: 20).

There has been, indeed, even in the Church, a disposition to exalt one over the other. The Alexandrian tendency was to give *"gnosis"* or knowledge a higher place than *"pistis"* or faith, which rests on authority, while the principle of AUGUSTINE, adopted by the *Scholastics,* was: *crede ut intelligas; fides præcedit intellectum,*— "believe that thou mayest understand; faith precedes understanding." But the question is not which precedes, but what is their relation to each other. JACOBI (d. 1819) confessed that to him dualism of faith and knowledge was hopeless. The Hegelian philosophy resolved faith into knowledge. SCHLEIERMACHER (d. 1843) maintained "that understanding and emotion are the two foci of our ellipse, and that oscillation is the universal form of all finite being."

In this whole discussion we must lay stress upon the fact, that faith itself, as such, is already a knowledge;

[1] So GERHARD and PHILIPPI.

— that it is an immediate and remains the immanent presupposition throughout the unfolding of this knowledge; that the antithesis of faith is not knowledge, but sight and mathematical demonstration.

CHRISTLIEB[1]: "All knowledge is, in the last instance, conditioned by faith; and faith is the preliminary and the medium of every act of intelligence. He who believes nothing, knows nothing. The antithesis is not that of faith and knowledge, but that of faith and unbelief."

4. *Because its results are in harmony with those of genuine philosophy.*[2]

There are those who maintain that philosophy and theology are irreconcilable. Hence some repudiate philosophy, considering theology as the fixed point,— while very many repudiate theology, denying its claims on the ground that it cannot be in harmony with philosophy. It is very true, that within the domain of theological thinking, even in the Christian Church, very different philosophical schools have risen and flourished. The struggle between Realism and Nominalism ran through generations. Aristotle and Plato have alternated as masters of Christian philosophy. Plato represents, in general, the idealistic tendency, and Aristotle, the practical and positive. Almost all philosophy is in some sense a development of one or the other of these tendencies, or an attempt to unite them. LUTHER spoke with special violence against the Aristotelian philosophy and perverted reason, and barren speculation in general. Melanchthon, who was more profoundly learned in Greek philosophy than Luther, thought better of Aristotle, and indeed advocated a sober Aristotelianism.

[1] See his *Modern Doubt and Christian Belief*, pp. 124—135.
[2] Compare KRAUTH'S *Manuscript Lectures.*

The later orthodox theologians of our Church come more in contact with logic as one of the philosophical sciences, than with metaphysical speculation. Philosophical sobriety and caution are eminently characteristics of the Lutheran Theology, and very few of its arguments and none of its doctrines rest on philosophical "data," which latter are ever likely to be subjects of dispute among men of solid thought.

Hollaz truly says: "Philosophy is not contrary or contradictory to revealed theology." Philosophy and theology should be made mutual co-workers. The fixed results of both are in harmony, and as the head and heart of man work conjointly, if they work healthily, so should Philosophy and Theology harmonize in their working and in their results.

The words of St. Paul (Col. 2: 8) imply no condemnation of a true philosophy, but the very contrary. He implies that there is a true philosophy which is no empty deceit, is not after tradition of men, and is according to Christ. But philosophy must be regarded only as a *handmaid* to theology.

CALOVIUS says: "Philosophy is not opposed to Theology: 1) because the true agrees with the true, and does not antagonize it, for what is known by the light of nature is no less true than that which is revealed in Scripture; 2) because natural and philosophical knowledge has its origin also in God; 3) because philosophy leads to a knowledge of God." But QUENSTEDT truly says: "Although Philosophy and the principles of Reason are not indeed contrary to Theology, nor the latter to the former, still there is a very great difference between those things that are divinely revealed in Scripture, and those which are known by the light of nature."

Theology does not condemn the use of Philosophy, but its abuse and its affectation of directorship as normative and decisive in divine things.

LUTHARDT: "Philosophy is the science of the natural consciousness, Theology of the renewed Christian consciousness; the former has to do with the world of creation and the general principles of Being, the latter treats of the world of Redemption and of Salvation; the former busies itself with theoretical issues, the latter with the practical issues of life."

5. *The Limitations of Theology.*

Theology is progressive, in the sense that our subjective understanding of the facts with regard to God, and our consequent expositions of these facts, may and do become more perfect. But theology is not progressive, if by this be meant that its objective facts change, either in their number or their nature. The limitations of theology lie: 1) In the finiteness of the human understanding; 2) in the imperfect state of science, both natural and metaphysical; 3) in the inadequacy of language; 4) in the incompleteness of our knowledge of the Scripture; 5) in the silence of written revelation; 6) in the lack of spiritual discernment caused by sin.[1]

§ 4. The Organism of Theology.

Positive Theology by its own nature divides itself into four main departments: 1) Biblical or Exegetical, 2) Historical, 3) Systematic, and 4) Practical. There can be no question as to the general correctness of this division, though there may be some in regard to the order of succession. Every division, however, is only relative, for in

[1] Strong, pp. 18, 19. Ed. 1886.

every single department of theological study all the others are involved. Each takes the hand of the other, and affords an outlook into the other.

1. *Fuller Definition.*

1) *Exegetical Theology* comprises all that relates to the exposition and elucidation of the Holy Scriptures. It consequently embraces Exegesis as an art, and all the branches of knowledge auxiliary to that art. To it belong the sciences of *Sacred Philology, Biblical Archæology, Isagogics* or Biblical Introduction and *Canonics, Biblical Criticism* (Textual and Higher), *Hermeneutics,* and *Exegesis,* as the practical application of Hermeneutics.

2) The result of the application of Exegetical Theology to the Bible lays the foundation of *Historical Theology.* It begins with *Sacred History,* and includes what has been developed in the Church in the shape of Church History and the History of Doctrine. Consequently it reaches back in its beginning into Exegesis and ends by throwing a bridge over into Systematic Theology. To Historical Theology belong the sciences of *Sacred History, Biblical Theology* (Old and New Testament), *Church History, Ecclesiastical Archæology, History of Doctrines, Patristics, Symbolics* and *Statistics.*

3) *Systematic Theology* is the highest form of theological science. It is the scientific and connected presentation of Christian doctrine in its relation to both faith and morals. For its successful study a previous culture is demanded, of an exegetical, historical and philosophical character. It naturally comprises the sciences of *Apologetics, Dogmatics* and *Ethics.* Although we accept the fact of Christianity as a divine

fact, this presupposition must be justified by science to the religious consciousness. Hence *Apologetics* properly precedes the treatment of purely dogmatic topics.

4) *Practical Theology* embraces the theory of the activities of the Church as these reveal themselves in the Church as a whole, and in the individual members and representatives of it, acting in the name of the Church. It presupposes all those branches of knowledge through which religion, in general, and Christianity, in particular, attain their scientific establishment and shape. To Practical Theology belong the sciences of *Catechetics, Liturgics, Homiletics, Pastoral Theology, Evangelistics* (Foreign Missions), *Diaconics* (Home Missions), and *Gybernetics* (Church Polity).

2. *Dogmatics and Ethics.*

The attempt was first made to treat these topics separately by the Reformed divines. CALIXTUS (d. 1656) was the first who introduced the change into the Lutheran Church, and the convenience and satisfactory character of this change have led to its almost universal adoption. *Dogmatics* and *Ethics* have usually been regarded as parallel sciences. The first gives an answer to the question, What thinkest thou of Christ? The second to the question, What thinkest thou of the true character of a Christian upon earth? The two sciences are so interlaced that Dogmatics cannot wholly leave Ethics untouched, and Ethics would become a small science indeed, if it were fully sundered from Dogmatics. There have not been wanting eminent theologians of recent date, who have been disposed to return to the old union in the treatment of these departments. The division, in fact, of Dogmatics and Ethics, is rather one of convenience, resulting from the vast range of their subjects, than one made necessary by the nature of the

case. Such a division, however, is favorable to the full and clear handling of both, and it is easy for the student, who masters them both, in separate treatises, to combine both in his heart, mind, life and labor.

§ 5. Name and Definition of Dogmatics.

Dogmatics is the science which presents in their connection and mutual relations, the doctrines or dogmas, which it is its aim to reproduce from the religious faith of the Christian himself, in harmony with the Scriptures and the teaching of the Church.[1]

1. *The Name of the Science.*

The name of this department of Theology has been various. Melanchthon calls his work "Loci." It has also been called "Corpus Doctrinæ;" Calvin called his work "Institutio;" Baier calls his "Positive Theology;" Quenstedt, "Systematic and Thetic Theology." In the 17th century the name *Dogmatic Theology* was introduced, and since Buddeus (d. 1729) this name has been the predominant one. No other name so accurately expresses what this branch of Theology proposes to itself. In English usage we have the terms—"Systematic Theology," "System of Theology," "Christian Dogmatics," "System of Christian Doctrine," etc. The term Dogmatic Theology or Dogmatics marks it as one of the three departments of Systematic Theology, which latter includes also Apologetics and Ethics.

2. *Definition of the word Dogma.*

The Greek word occurs first in the writings of Xenophon and Plato, and its primary meaning is *decree,* a

[1] Luthardt.

conclusion of a popular assembly. In this sense of a *decree*, an *ordinance*, it is used in the New Testament. In a secondary sense in classical usage, the word *dogma* designates a philosophical proposition, and it is applied to the authoritative and categorical 'sentences' of the philosophers. Cicero speaks of the "*decreta*" (tenets), "which philosophers call *dogmata*." The word easily passed over to the meaning of "doctrine" or "doctrinal statements." Ignatius speaks of "the *dogmata* of the Lord and his Apostles." Origen styles the Apostles as "teachers of dogmas." Since the fourth century the word has come to be more and more limited to "doctrine," articles of faith, in opposition to the doctrines of Ethics, and in distinction from *preaching*, as the popular presentation of truth.

MARTENSEN:[1] "A confessing and witnessing Church cannot be conceived to exist without a definite sum of doctrines or *dogmas*. A dogma is not a subjective human opinion, nor an indefinite, vague notion; nor is it a mere truth of reason, whose universal validity can be made clear with mathematical or logical certainty. It is a truth of *faith*, derived from the authority of the word and revelation of God;—a *positive* truth, positive not merely by virtue of the positiveness with which it is laid down, but also, and mainly by virtue of the authority with which it is sealed."

3. *The Definition of Dogmatics.*

The *Scholastics* and our own older Dogmaticians regarded Dogmatics as an historico-apologetic science,—a systematically arranged delineation of the doctrine of the Church, with confirmation of it drawn from Holy Writ. According to QUENSTEDT (d. 1688) "it sets forth the theological commonplaces or topics in order, per-

[1] See his *Christian Dogmatics*. § 1.

spicuously explains them, accurately defines the dogmas or doctrines of faith, and divides them, deducing them from the Holy Scriptures, which is their primary place and in which they are grounded, demonstrating them from the same." LUTHARDT says that in this definition there is wanting the systematic development from a material principle, inasmuch as the matter is supposed by it to be already finished by the existing Church doctrine.

At a later period Dogmatics came to be conceived of as an historical science. BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS (d. 1843) says: "There exists at the present time, properly speaking, three views or modes of delineating Christian doctrine. According to the *first*, the system of the Church is clearly and accurately delineated; according to the *second*, the doctrine of the Church is translated into the doctrine of the delineator; according to the *third*, the doctrine of the Church is laid as the basis and compared with the doctrine of the Bible. The first of these three methods may be called the symbolic, the second the philosophic, and the third the historico-critical method. As the first of these methods is indolent, and the second dishonest, we feel no hesitation in giving preference to the third, and the third alone, as the truly Protestant way." SCHLEIERMACHER defines Dogmatic Theology "as the science of the doctrines accepted in a Christian Church at any particular time." In his "Encyclopædia"[1] he attempts to show that Dogmatics may be orthodox and heterodox at the same time, i. e., it is possible to hold fast to what is already generally acknowledged, together with the consequences which legitimately flow from it, and at the same time keep the doctrinal conception fluctuating

[1] §203—209. English translation by Farrer under the title, "Brief Outline of the Study of Theology." Edinburgh, 1850.

and to strive to make room for new methods of apprehending it. To this tendency of the theology of Schleiermacher may be largely traced the vacillation, vagueness, and indeterminateness of the German Theology since his time, down to our own.

In a somewhat similar strain DORNER also expresses himself: "This problem to mentally master Christian truth as truth,—must be regarded as a standing problem for the Church, which, consciously or experimentally, has to propagate the contents of Christian faith *as truth.* No age can undertake the task for another age; each must perform the work anew for itself, however valuable may be the aid of the past, and however assured the continuity which exists." ROTHE also makes Dogmatics an historical and confessional branch of theology and separates it from what he considers Speculative Theology. As TWESTEN regards the Christian consciousness as the point of departure of the genetic treatment, he designates Dogmatics as a living reproduction of the faith of the Church from the soul of the delineator.

PHILIPPI says: "Systematic Theology has no other aim than the teaching of Christian religion, as this is established in the experimental consciousness of the believer, to reproduce it spiritually and to bring it into a scientific, systematic form, for the delineation and development in every direction of its divinely wrought facts in Jesus Christ."

KAHNIS defines Christian Dogmatics as having for its aim the unfolding of the articles of faith from the *material principle* of justification by faith, and the demonstration of them from the *formal principle* of the absolute authority of Scripture. Yet more decisive in demanding purely reproductive treatment, HOF-

MANN[1] designates the Christian doctrinal system as the scientific self-expression of the theologian, i. e., of his personal self-dependent relation to God. He says, in expanding this idea: "This systematic activity is not the describing of the religious state of mind appropriate to Christians, nor an echo of the contents of the spiritual and Church doctrine in the particular shape which they take in my own mind, nor a derivation of the Christian knowledge from one ultimate principle, but it is the unfolding of the simple matter of fact which makes the Christian a Christian, and distinguishes him from one who is not a Christian, thus exhibiting the manifold richness of its matter." So also in substance FRANK.

MARTENSEN: "Dogmatics is not only a science of faith, but also a knowledge grounded *in,* and drawn *from* faith. It is not a mere historical exhibition of what has been, or now is, true for others, without being true for the author; nor is it a philosophical knowledge of Christian truth, obtained from a standpoint outside of faith and the Church." Dogmatics, then, is the sum of the truths embraced in the Christian faith in their organic connection with the facts of religious consciousness. It apprehends divine truth primarily on its intellectual side. It is the science of that, of which the Christian affections and the Christian life are the great art. We can only sunder it from them theoretically, practically it should never be sundered from them.

4. *Relation to other Branches of Theology.*

Systematic Theology (covering Apologetics, Dogmatics, and Ethics), as the highest form of theological science, follows the study of Exegetical and Historical

[1] In his *Schriftbeweis,* I, pp. 9—11. Reference will be made to first edition 3 vols. 1852—55.

Theology. Dogmatics presupposes the truth of Christianity in general, and therefore Apologetics properly precedes the treatment of the purely dogmatic topics, and may properly be regarded as an independent introduction to Dogmatics. As Dogmatics forms the center of theology, we may expect to find in it the results of exegetical and historical investigation, and so connected as to form a scientific whole, thus laying the basis for the doctrine of morals (Ethics), and for Practical Theology. The whole of Ethics will find its appropriate place, not within Dogmatics, but at its end.

Biblical Theology, or the exposition of the doctrinal and ethical contents of Scripture, is the historical counterpart of Dogmatics and Ethics, not their substitute, and precedes the study of Dogmatics. We must lay stress upon the historical character of Biblical Theology in order to preserve Dogmatics and Ethics their individuality and independence as theological sciences. Biblical Theology as a department of Historical Theology has for its aim to represent the religious ideas and doctrines of the Bible, while Dogmatics as a historico-philosophical science aims to unify and systematize the results of historical exegesis. Biblical Theology is thus nothing else than the exegetical foundation for Dogmatic Theology. It furnishes the material with which this latter science builds, but we must not forget, as has been truly remarked by Dr. Shedd, that Dogmatic Theology should balance and correct Biblical Theology for two reasons: 1) Because Biblical Theology, as a rule, is based only upon certain parts of Scripture, and its method is fractional; 2) Because it is more easy to introduce subjective individual opinions into a part of the Bible, than into the whole of it.

II. CONTENTS OF DOGMATICS.

§ 6. Name and Definition of Religion.

Religion is the relation of the fellowship of man with God, a relation grounded in the nature of man and actualized in Christianity.

1. *The Universal Fact of Religion.*

The famous classic saying of Cicero, "Among so many kinds of creatures there is none besides man which has any knowledge of God; among men there is no people so wild and savage as not to have believed in a God, even if it does not know what one,"[1] expresses nothing but an undeniable fact. The experience of centuries has corroborated it. No people is without a consciousness of God. Wherever human beings have been found, there, too, has religion been found. The lowest tribes have conscience, fear death, believe in witches, and try to frighten away evil fates.

2. *The Word Religion.*

The derivation of the word *religion* has been much discussed. *a)* Some would derive it from *"relinquere,"* as designating a separating from the world; *b)* Lactantius derives the word from *"religare," to bind back,* as indicating that bond of piety with which we are united to God. So Augustine and our older Dogmaticians; *c)* But the true derivation is from *relegere, "to ponder over a thing,"* thus designating a diligent attention to those things which pertain to the worship of God. So already Cicero and the later grammarians; also Philippi and the later Dogmaticians.

[1] Cic. *De legibus*, i: 8, 24.

3. *The Definition of Religion.*

In the word *religion,* and in the related Greek words used in the New Testament (threskeia, latreia, and the original for "superstitious" in Acts 17: 22), is expressed a relation of man to God, the particular character of which cannot be known from the words themselves. The most wide-reaching, broad, yet definite, expression of the relation to God, which is involved in the true use of the word religion, is expressed by Augustine in the first passage of his "Confessions": "Thou, O God, hast made us for thyself, and our heart is at unrest, until it rests in thee." The universal religious tendency demands as a postulate, communion with God, in some shape or other. This feeling is common to all forms of faith, however dim it may be, and however obscured by superstition. It springs from the innate yearning of the creature for pardon, love, and fellowship with the Creator. It is the aspiration of the intellectual and moral being towards its source,—as St. Paul expresses it,—it is a feeling and seeking after God, if haply they might find him (Acts 17: 27). Christianity is the actuality of this fellowship, and at the same time is also the actualizing of the ideal of religion. BECK[1] says: "Christianity as the religion for the whole world, must of necessity embrace all the genuine elements of all religion; and just as necessarily must present in itself the essence of all religion, as it judges and rejects all that conflicts with the essence." PHILIPPI[2] remarks, "that it has become a pretty general proposition of the New Theology, in its various forms and tendencies, so far as it can yet claim the name Christian, to define Christianity, the Christian religion,

[1] In his *Einleitung in das System der christlichen Lehre.* Stuttgart, 1838. Page 49.

[2] In his *Kirchliche Glaubenslehre,* I, 1.

as a fellowship of man with God, mediated through Christ, or to speak more accurately, restored through Christ. This *principle,* which has become a dogmatic presupposition, is in fact sufficiently strict in the distinction it draws, to exclude every unchristian and antichristian point of view, and yet again in its simplicity and comprehensiveness, broad enough, to embrace every Christian point of view, properly such, however diverse may be the forms of that view."

MARTENSEN: All religion is a sense of God's existence, and of man's relation to God. Religion may therefore be more accurately described as man's consciousness of his communion with God, of his union with God. It is a relation of personal life and being to God, in the true sense of the word, a *life* in God... The religious feeling in its fundamental form is a feeling of *unbounded reverence.* In this is involved the deepest feeling of dependence, of finiteness, of *creatureship,* of humility; at the same time, it implies that the Power on which I feel myself to be dependent is the good, the holy Power to which I feel myself in my conscience bound; not a Fate, which can be an object of fear only, not of reverence.[1]

§ 7. The Origin and Essential Character of Religion.

Religion is not merely a matter of a single side of the life of a soul, but is a fact of the entire internal life. It has its origin in the very nature and essence of man and is the tie of personal relationship between man and God.

1. *The Origin of Religion.*

Religion is not the invention of statesmen and intriguing rulers, a view advocated by some of the Deists,

[1] *Dogmatics,* § 4, 7.

Atheists and Materialists of the last century; nor is it to be traced to the phenomena of nature, or the perception of marks of design in nature; neither are we to regard the intellectual tendency of the mind as the root of religious faith and devotion, thus making religion the fruit of an intellectual curiosity; neither did it take its origin in fetich-worship of ancestors; neither are we to regard it simply as the result of divine instruction, as the older Dogmaticians,—but religion is an inner necessity of man. Its origin is found in the aspirations of the human soul. It is as essential for man to have a religion as it is for man to love. As man cannot live without his fellow-men, so can he not live without God. It can as little be called an invention as eating, drinking, sleeping, or talking. It is a thing natural, intrinsically necessary, *rooted in man's very being*. It is that remains of the divine image through which all external self-attestation of God enters. Man is a religious being and has a capacity for this divine life. He is only actually religious when he enters into a living relation with God.

2. *The Essential Character of Religion.*[1]

The universality of religion is a proof of its intrinsic necessity. It has its grounds, its cause, and its necessity in the very constitution and essence of the human spirit. The very existence of man presupposes the religious craving, the seeking after God. God is the deepest need of man, his highest aim, and that for which he is incessantly striving. All the powers of our mind do not find their aim till they find God. Communion with God is the truth of man, religion his true life. Without religion he can not truly be called man.

[1] Compare LUTHARDT'S Apologetic Lectures on the *Fundamental Truths of Christianity*. Edinburgh, 1869. This whole paragraph has been condensed from Lecture 6.

There is a tie between us and God—a tie of relationship. As iron tends towards the magnet, as the rivers empty themselves into the sea, as the stone is attracted towards the earth, so is the soul drawn to God, its origin and its home. This tie, this attraction of the soul toward God, this craving for love, for personal fellowship, for intimate familiar intercourse, is the foundation of all religion, all revelation.

Such is the *cause* of religion in man, and its *dwelling-place* is his inmost soul.

§ 8. The Actuality and Truth of Religion.

In its psychological actuality, as subjective, Religion is not a matter of mere knowledge, or of mere will, or of mere emotion, but of the whole inner man, of the heart. All definitions which present one of these three to the exclusion of both the others, or two of these to the exclusion of the third, are defective if not absolutely false. Mere knowledge is rationalism or dead orthodoxism; mere activity is legalism or morality; mere emotion is fanaticism or mysticism; but heavenly knowledge, applied by the Holy Ghost to the renewal of the affections and the producing of an earnest spirit, whose fruits are deeds of love, is the basis and, in its connection, the completion of true religion.

In its historical actuality, as objective, it is a matter of fellowship, manifesting itself in the common religious life. Positive religion has its truth and actuality in Christianity.

1. *Religion in its subjective sense.*

Religion has been variously contemplated as a matter of knowledge, a matter of will, or a matter of emotion; but in fact it is not a matter of isolated points in the spiritual life,—it is each one of these, and all of these, and more than all. Religion is a mater of *knowledge,* for to know the only true God and Jesus Christ is life eternal (John 17: 3). But religion is not a mere subject of knowledge, for knowledge does not make a man pious, nor does orthodoxy constitute him a believer. It is a matter of the *will,* for it must be a moral act, and Jesus himself says: "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching" (John 7: 17). But religion is not a mere willing and doing, it is also a matter of the *feelings,* for it is "peace and joy in the Holy Ghost" (Rom. 14: 17). But neither is it this alone; it is at once *knowing, willing,* and *feeling,* because it is the matter of the whole inner man, of the root of his personal life,—of the heart, as Scripture designates the center of the personal life of the inner man. For the Bible transfers the abode of religion, and the transactions of the religious life, to the heart. The Word must pierce the heart (Acts 2: 37); the heart must be open to the Word (Acts 16: 14); with the heart man believeth unto righteousness (Rom. 10: 10).

Our Lutheran Dogmaticians do not discuss this point till after the time of Gerhard, when QUENSTEDT (d. 1688) and HOLLAZ (d. 1713) define the Christian Religion "as that mode of worshiping the true God, which is prescribed in his Word." BAIER (d. 1695) defines religion as "the acts of the mind and of the will, which are occupied concerning God, in which acts God is rightly acknowledged and rightly worshiped." BUD-

DEUS (d. 1729) says: "It is usual to separate religion into two parts, the true knowledge of God, and the worship which is due to him." He observes in this connection that in his day the greater stress was laid upon the knowledge of God, "for," says he, "it is most common to distinguish the religions into which the world is divided by the doctrines or opinions which men cherish concerning God and divine things." Since the time of Buddeus, the ordinary definition of religion has been "a mode of knowing and worshiping God."

Rationalism and supernaturalism regard religion as a knowledge, and regard cultus or worship as the exercise of religion.

Schleiermacher defines religion as "a determination of emotion." But religion is not to be regarded as a mere determination, i. e., as something passive, and consequently is not the mere feeling of a bare condition in which the man himself is, as it were, put out of the question, but it is a personal relation. In consequence of this truer view and over against Schleiermacher, BECK says: "The psychological primal shape of religion cannot lie in an isolated fact of the spiritual life, nor in one isolated activity, as, for example, emotion, for religion embraces in its very origin all factors and activities of the spiritual life in their unity." He says in another place, "the essence of all actual religion rests upon and contains, both as to its form, and objective and subjective reality, faith; this is true also of its basis and its contents" (2 Cor. 5: 7; Heb. 11). Similar views are expressed by Philippi and Kahnis.

The fellowship, however, of the individual with God involves and is followed by the common life of religion, or as KAHNIS[1] expresses it,—"is not a mere knowing,

[1] See his *Dogm.* I. 142.

not a mere feeling, not a mere willing, but rather a consciousness (knowledge combined with conviction) of God on the ground of emotion, accompanied by moral surrender."

2. *Religion in the objective sense.*

In its objective sense religion is the common religious life presenting itself in doctrine, constitution and worship, and is, consequently, in one aspect, the sequel as it is in another, the presupposition, of subjective religion. Its self-presentation is a thing of internal necessity. Thus the subjective religion which we call Lutheranism, is the result of the subjective faith of the great restorers of the pure faith; but once established, it becomes the presupposition to the subjective faith of those who hold it in its pure form. The renewed Christianity of the sixteenth century, the Reformation, was the result of the faith of the Reformers, and our faith is the result of the Reformation. Man is not merely an individual, an isolated intellectual being, but a being of history and fellowship.

3. *True and False Religion.*

When we speak of *false religion* we use the word *religion* improperly, for that is only properly *religion,* which involves the true worship of the true God. The *true* religion is that which is conformed to the Divine Word. A *false* religion either gives worship to a false god or gives false worship to the true God (HOLLAZ).

The marks of the true religion are thus stated by HOLLAZ.[1]

1) *It is the most ancient religion.* Error may be old, but truth is always older, inasmuch as God is older

[1] And developed by Dr. Krauth in his *Manuscript Lectures*, from which I have adapted this paragraph.

than the devil. Paganism is old, but revealed religion is older; Polytheism is old, but Monotheism is the oldest religion. The earliest record of the true religion is in the first two chapters of Genesis. If Satan and his host fell early, they were holy still earlier.

2) *It was approved by the Fathers even of the Old Testament.* It is a mark of the true religion, that it has always had an unbroken life in the history of the world, from the earliest patriarchs to the present hour.

3) *It illustrates the glory of God.* False religion obscures that glory and utterly sets it aside. *"They change,"* says St. Paul, *"the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man"* (Rom. 1: 23).

4) *True religion rightly teaches faith in Jesus, the author of salvation.* It solves the great problem of redemption; it tells us what redemption is, who our Redeemer is, even Jesus Christ, shows us how we are united to him, and rightly teaches that faith. It alone meets the deepest yearnings of our human being; other religions either obscure man's desire after redemption, or deepen his sense of misery, or drive him to useless and cruel modes, in which he attempts to propitiate God.

5) *True religion earnestly inculcates holiness of life.* It furnishes the power by God's grace of perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord. False religions, on the other hand, are immoral, either by positive teaching favorable to vice, or by lack of power to bring forth holy living.

6) *True religion alone gives a peaceful conscience.* The sense of disturbed relation between God and the sinner, with the pang which it brings, has found relief in nothing but the religion of the Bible. Other reli-

gions leave the conscience in perfect torment, lull it into false security, sear it into apathy, or abandon it to despair.

7) *True religion alone produces joy and peace in the hour of death.* False religion may produce a spiritual torpor, or a defiant and fierce attitude of the soul in dying, but true religion alone gives pure trust and hope, which knows its own reason, and a calm and sometimes triumphant departure from this world. It alone robs death of its sting and the grave of its victory.

The difficulty indeed is not to find manifold marks to distinguish the true religion from the false, but to select from the vast number. The great danger of presenting the *Evidences of Christianity* is that of confusing the mind and weakning the impression by dwelling on too many. QUENSTEDT describes the characteristics of the true religion as follows: 1) Divine sublimity (divine in its origin); 2) Unity; 3) Truth; 4) Perfection (contains perfectly and sufficiently all things necessary to faith and Christian life); 5) Holiness (it teaches a knowledge of a holy God, the cultivation of a holy life, it communicates holy precepts, reveals holy mysteries); 6) Necessity; 7) Utility; 8) Antiquity; 9) Invincibility; 10) Perpetuity; 11) Spontaneity (is not compulsory, but seeks to be taught, and calls for unconstrained assent); 12) Varied treatment (exposed to various persecutions, obscured but not extinguished, oppressed but not suppressed); 13) Efficacy (in illustrating the glory of God, in soothing the conscience, in converting men, in cherishing growth in piety, etc.).

The *truth* of religion reveals itself in this, that it is the truth of man, that truth which brings man to the great goal of his being, in whatever respect we consider it,—for God is the goal of man, of man's individual

life, and of man in society, and all man's advance is conditioned by religion. The Christian religion is the true religion, because it restores the fellowship of man with God through Christ.

The perversions of Religion arise out of the perversions of the relation of the consciousness of God and the consciousness of the world.

LUTHARDT classifies this perversion in a fourfold way:

1. The mingling or identification of the two, God and the world, leading to *Pantheism* when the universe is regarded as a whole with God, and to *Polytheism* when it is regarded in its separate constituents. *Pantheism* does away with the idea of God, of spirit, and of moral freedom. It so blends God and the world, that God is the world and the world is God, and there is neither *true* world nor true God. The philosophic tendency of Pantheism has moved under two opposite impulses. Under the first it merges God in the world, and thus falls into *Materialism;* in the other it merges the world into God, and thus becomes *Absolute Idealism.* Over against this tendency theology can only link itself with the philosophy which acknowledges a living, personal God. *Polytheism* is the theory which assumes the existence of many gods. It had its origin in nature worship and in the principles of Pantheism. Whenever it appears as a philosophy it appears as the exoteric counterpart of Pantheism.

The superstition, which is connected with the errors of Pantheism and Polytheism, mistakes or ignores the moral nature of the relation between God and man.

2. The second perversion results from the false separation of these two spheres of consciousness, leading to *Deism* and a mechanical view of the world. *Deism* ac-

knowledges the personality of God, believes him to be Creator of all things, but separates him from the world, so far as all continuous and sympathetic relation is concerned. To Deism the world is a great clock, made, wound up, and set going, and then left by its Creator. God makes the world and then forsakes the world. He is the creator of man, but not his father, he has put forth his hand to make us, but he never opens his mouth to speak to us. Deism, therefore, denies a particular providence, a supernatural revelation, miracles, prophecies, redemption, and the work of the Spirit. As it is the vice of Pantheism that it makes God immanent in the world so as to be confounded with it, so it is the characteristic vice of Deism, to deny that relative immanence of God in the world, by which he conserves it, guides it, and controls it for the highest ends of his wisdom and love.[1]

3. The third perversion of religion is that, in which the consciousness of the world is unduly suppressed by the consciousness of God, as in *Mysticism*. Mysticism sets aside the cosmical, because it is finite, allows it no validity over against the divine. It strives to rise to direct communion with God, but loses itself in the infinite fulness. It is antithetical to reception on authority *(pistis,* "faith"), and to the recognition of truth by the ordinary use of the faculties *(gnosis,* "knowledge"); but in its soberer forms it takes both into its service, holding them in a relative subservience[2]. Dispensing with the means of grace, often beginning in a pure, deep piety, it has run out in dangerous extravagances. Often it has been a reaction against the externalism of a dead church. The grades of Mysticism were puri-

[1] Compare *Manuscript Lectures* of Dr. Krauth.
[2] See Article on *Mysticism* in Johnson's *Cyclopœdia* by Dr. Krauth.

fication, illumination, ecstatic union, and absorption. It was generally theistic, but in no small number of cases pantheistic. Of Mysticism as a "perversion" we have illustrations in the old Anabaptists, in Paracelsus, Boehme, Swedenborg, and among the Quakers and Swedenborgians. There is a pure internalism to which the name Mysticism is sometimes given, which is not to be confounded with it as we here use the term.

4. The fourth perversion of religion rises from the suppression of the consciousness of God by the consciousness of the world. This looks so steadily at the work that it forgets the worker,—it is so absorbed in the motion, that it does not think of the mover. It regards the beautiful harmony of the world as if it were self-caused. This perversion is *Atheism*, and in philosophy, *Materialism*. Atheism may be either speculative or practical; the former consists in denying the existence of God; the latter in living as if there were no God.

4. *Natural and Positive Religion.*

Religion is divided into natural and positive. When we speak of *Natural Religion*, we do not mean precisely what is generally called "The Religion of Nature," nor the philosophical abstraction of English Deism since the seventeenth century. We mean rather the religion correspondent with what we call Natural Theology. The Religion of Nature generally means a system developed in professed independence of Revelation and often in antagonism to it. It is the religion, for the most part, of infidels. By *Natural Religion* we here mean those principles which are involved in the very structure of human thinking, the psychological basis of *Positive Religion*. All positive religion assumes certain things as fixed. It does not prove them, but accepts them and

builds on them, as the first verse of the Bible takes God for granted and begins with his work.

LORD HERBERT OF CHERBURY (1581—1648) in his work *De Veritate* (1624) lays down five fundamental principles, which he maintains have been received at all times and in all places, independent of revelation, and which are sufficient for salvation. These five propositions are: 1) There is a God; 2) The Supreme being ought to be worshiped; 3) Virtue and Piety are the chief parts of the worship of God; 4) The abhorrence of what is criminal ought always to be in the soul; 5) There are rewards and penalties after this life. — It is manifest that Lord Herbert has borrowed very largely from the Revelation he proposes to supersede. The work of Herbert was answered in 1667 by the great divine, John Musæus of Jena, in his Dissertation on "The light of nature and the Natural Theology which rests on it, are insufficient for salvation." BAIER in his *Compend,*[1] following Musæus says: "Natural Theology can be thus defined: It is a practical science, drawn from the principles of nature, concerning God, prescribing to man, who is a pilgrim, a worship fitting the character of God, and explaining, confirming, and defending it, in order to secure that eternal blessedness, which is to be obtained in God and from God." Inasmuch as sin has obscured natural religion, it, as a consequence, is prevented from knowing anything of that propitiation which sin itself has made necessary, and hence Baier infers that natural religion is insufficient for salvation.

Positive Religion, in accordance with the new usage of language subsequent to Kant and Schleiermacher, is a product of history, rests upon the institution of Religion, and appeals for its doctrines and precepts to Divine

[1] Edition of PREUSS, 1864. P. 18.

authority, and has its truth and actuality in Christianity. It belongs only to God himself to prescribe for man how he wishes to be served and worshiped, and only by the aid of the higher revelation can we explain the original development of the religious life. "We may conclude in the twofold proposition: 1) All religion has its origin in original revelation; 2) Pure religion requires continuous and nearer revelation of God."[1]

PHILIPPI: God can only place himself in fellowship with man through revelation; the objective establishment of this divine fellowship with man is Revelation.

§9. The Essential Character and Truth of Christianity.

Christianity is the personal fellowship of salvation on the part of man with God, in the Holy Ghost,—a fellowship mediated through Jesus Christ, and hence Christianity embraces whatever is true in antecedent religions.

1. *The Relation of Christianity to Heathenism and Judaism.*

According to PHILIPPI (I. 4): "Heathenism seeks but fails; Talmudic Judaism and Mohammedanism seek but disdain; the Old Testament Judaism has sought and has not yet found, moving upon the right path, but not attaining to the goal; Christianity alone has found, because in Christ the true and actual fellowship of man with God has been founded again."

MARTENSEN (§ 15): "Heathenism is unacquainted with the problem of creation, or the religious problem presented by dependence on a holy God... Christianity solves this problem by its gospel of the *Incarnation of God* in Christ... The heathen's notion of the union of

[1] Van Oosterzee: *Dogmatics*, § 27.

God and man is not the notion that God has become man, but that man becomes God,— not the notion of an incarnation of God, but of an *apotheosis* of man. The idea of incarnation dawns on the Jew in his Messianic hope, but is checked by the constant fear of making God and man one in essence; for which reason the perfect conception of the incarnation is not here found."

"The separation between heaven and earth is not only that between Creator and creature, but between the holy God and a sinful world. Heathenism knows nothing of this problem; Judaism lives and moves in this problem; but the *restoration* of the broken relation, the *atonement* for sin, is in Judaism only foreshadowed by types and prophecies. Not until God becomes incarnate in Christ, does the true Mediator enter into the world. God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself (2 Cor. 5: 19). In this gospel of the crucified One is contained the solution of the hard problem of sinfulness."

2. *The Essential Character of Christianity.*

This lies in the fellowship of salvation with God through Jesus Christ. That which is most peculiar in Christianity is the attitude taken by the Person of Christ, not as an idea simply, but a fact,—God and man in personal unity. Our Lord is not merely the founder of Religion, but is the subject and center of it. What Christ *was* is more completely essential to Christianity than what he *taught*.

MARTENSEN (§ 15): "The essence of Christianity is, therefore, nothing else than Christ himself. The founder of the religion is himself its sum and substance. He is not merely the founder of a religion; His person cannot be separated from the doctrine which he proclaims, but has an eternal, ever-present significance for the

human race. As he is the Mediator and Propitiator, the sacred point of unity between God and the sinful world, so is He also continually the *Redeemer* of the human race."

The idea of Christianity is inseparable from the conception of Miracles and Inspiration. We may with Martensen,[1] in general terms, designate the miracle of the Incarnation as the fundamental miracle of Christianity. Christ himself is the prime miracle of Christianity, since his coming is the absolutely *new* beginning of a spiritual creation in the human race.— He is the new or Second Adam. But in order to be able to appropriate to itself the new revelation in Christ, the human race must also receive a new spirit; the spirit of Christ must enter into a permanent union with man. The miracle of the Incarnation is hence inseparable from that of *Inspiration,* or the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost. The miracle of inspiration is the same in the subjective, as the miracle of the revelation of Christ in the objective, sphere. To these two new beginnings, which form two sides of one and the same fundamental miracle, the miracle of the new creation, Christianity and the Christian Church trace their origin.

3. *The Historical modes of apprehending the essential Character of Christianity.*

The *Greek Church* regarded the manifestation of the *Logos* as the absolute divine reason, and hence it conceived of Christianity as the true Philosophy. The *Roman Catholic Church* laid stress upon the churchly organism, as containing the truth and the life-controlling power. The *Reformation* proceeds from the sinner's need of salvation and places the essential charac-

[1] Condensed from §16 of his *Dogmatics.*

ter of Christianity in salvation through justification by faith alone: *solus Christus, sola fides.*

4. *Christianity is the True Religion.*

That Christianity is the true religion can be proved: 1) by the *history of the different religions,* comparing Christianity with the other so-called religions; 2) *psychologically,* as it alone can satisfy the deepest want of man and bring peace to the soul; 3) *practically,* because it alone furnishes the power of God's grace of perfecting holiness in the Church, and in the heart of the individual.[1]

Strong as these various arguments, and all those generally used in the treatment of the Evidences of Christianity, may seem to be, they find their full strength only when they have been preceded by the evidence of Christian experience. You can only know Christianity at its full worth when you know it from experience (John 7: 17; Rom. 1: 16; 1 Cor. 2: 4, 5, 10; 2 Cor. 4: 6, 13).[2]

§10. The Antithesis of Romanism and Protestantism.

Romanism makes the truth dependent on the guarantees of the Church, hierarchically constituted, i. e. the Roman Church, and thus exalts ecclesiastical legitimacy to the principle which alone is decisive. Protestantism contemplates the essence of Christianity in the truth of salvation by the grace of God in Jesus Christ alone,

[1] See §8, 3, pp. 47—51.

[2] We cannot recommend too highly Stearns' *Evidence of Christian Experience.* New York, 1892. In a certain sense it is a reproduction of the famous work of FRANK *(System der christlichen Gewissheit).*

of which truth the Holy Scriptures give witness with a normative authority, the Church only with conditional authority. The Christian is to attain an individual assurance of this truth.

1. *False or at least inadequate explanations.*

The opposition of Protestantism and Romanism has often been explained in a manner either totally false or entirely inadequate. The opposition has been made to result from purely external, natural and even fortuitous diversities,— from the ardent imagination of the South and the cool reflectiveness of the North. The attempt has also been made to reduce it to formal categories, such as authority, freedom, and the like.

2. *The general statement of the Antithesis.*

SCHLEIERMACHER[1] says: "Protestantism makes the relation of the individual to the Church dependent on his relation to Christ; Catholicism makes the relation of the individual to Christ to depend on his relation to the Church." TWESTEN[2] says: "The Catholic doctrine holds more firmly to the first, Protestantism more firmly to the second part of the utterance of Irenæus, 'Where the Church is, there is also the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace.'" MOEHLER[3] (d. 1838, Roman Catholic) says: "Catholic doctrine considers the visible Church as the *prius*, the first thing, the invisible Church as the *posterius*, the second thing; the Protestant Church considers the invisible as the *prius* and the visible as the

[1] *Glaubenslehre* I, §24.

[2] In his *Dogmatics* I, p. 74.

[3] See his *Symbolik*, §48. Tenth edition, 1888. The sixth German edition (1843) was translated into English. 2 vols. London, 1843. A work worthy of careful examination.

posterius." MARTENSEN[1] says: "Catholicism has developed itself into a great system of *guarantees* of Christianity; but Christianity, the thing itself, which was thus to be guaranteed, has been thrown into the shade. The opposition between genuine and spurious Christianity has been gradually reduced to the affirmation and the negation of the validity of these guarantees. To attack the infallibility of the Pope and of the Church is the prime heresy."

3. *The essential character of Romanism.*

The essential character of Romanism is the identifying of Christianity with that outward hierarchical Church which culminates in the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, the Church, the organism of which claims to be inspired, the infallible bearer and guarantee of the truth, — to be subject to which, therefore, is the supremest duty of the Christian.

The Church is, therefore, by necessary consequence, a visible and palpable state, the vicar of Christ, representing his offices of Prophet, Priest and King, the continuation of his Incarnation, the mediatrix of salvation. It divides itself into the Church *teaching* and the Church *hearing,* the Church *commanding* and the Church *obeying.* Its essence is of a *legal,* not of an *evangelical* kind. It is to the individual the supremest judicial and saving authority; obedience to it is so unconditional that there can be no justification or an assurance of faith and of the Christian conscience resting in the Word of God, over against this Church (LUTHARDT).

So in substance also MARTENSEN (pp. 25—30): "The Catholic Church holds to a living apostolate in the

[1] Compare his *Christian Dogmatics,* p. 30 (English Translation).

Church, perpetuating itself through all time — an inspiration constantly kept up in the representatives of the Church. She claims to possess in the decisions of the councils and of the Pope a divine utterance invested with apostolic authority, as infallible as the word of the first apostles which was spoken in the world; and she claims to have in these decrees the infallible interpretation, an infallible continuation, of that apostolic word."

4. *Romanism Criticized.*

The antithesis of Protestantism consequently consists primarily in the results which are reached by the overthrow of the theory just characterized. BONIFACE VIII says: "To be subject to the Pope of Rome, we declare, say, and define, to be altogether necessary to salvation, on the part of every human creature." PERRONE, the most distinguished Roman Dogmatician of the 19th century (d. 1876), whose system of Dogmatics is now most widely used in the Roman Catholic Church, and which comes up most fully to its standard of orthodoxy, says: "Outside of or beyond the Catholic Church (i. e. the Roman Church) there is no salvation."

1) Over against the identifying of the true Catholic or Universal Church with the Church of Rome, on which all these claims to supremacy rest, together with the right of putting heretics to death, Protestantism maintains that the Catholic or Universal Church exists also outside of the Roman Church, and that the utmost she can claim is that within her bounds are some members of that one Holy Catholic or Christian Church, which is the Communion of Saints, and that in it alone her members can find salvation.

2) The Roman Church lays claim to Inspiration and Infallibility. MOEHLER says: "The Church must be

without error, for the believer who commits himself to her dare not be led astray."

Over against this, Protestantism shows that there are heresies of the Bishops of Rome, which Romanists themselves are constrained to acknowledge. Thus, for example, Pope Liberius in 358 set forth an heretic creed and condemnation of Athanasius; Pope Honorius I (d. 638) maintained Monotheletism, and was condemned by the sixth œcumenical Council held at Constantinople (681), as one possessed by demons, who sowed the seed of pernicious heresies, and he was excommunicated, and his successor on the papal throne confirmed the decree of the Council. Another great historical fact, overthrowing such claims, is the schism of the fifteenth century, rival Popes, and the conflict with the general Councils of that century, with the Popes, and with each other. The history of the Council of Trent (1545—1563), as narrated by Romanists themselves, especially of the truth-loving SARPI[1] (d. 1623), expels all idea of such infallibility. Another great fact is the contradiction of doctrine within the church of Rome itself; e. g., the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the virgin Mary, set forth in our time as an article of faith (1854), was rejected universally at one time, and did not cease to be denied until its official promulgation.[2]

3) The unreliableness of tradition has been demonstrated in ABELARD'S (d. 1142) *Sic et Non*, in which he placed side by side the downright contradictions of the Fathers; the one affirming that the thing was, and the other, with equal earnestness, that it was not so.

[1] His work was translated into English in 1676.

[2] See PREUSS: *Die römische Lehre von der unbefleckten Empfängniss, etc.* Translated into English, 1867, but since recalled by the translator (1871), because of his becoming a Roman Catholic.

In the Church of Rome there is a manifest and direct contradiction between her doctrines and worship and the Holy Scriptures, as, e. g., in the Communion in one kind, which as all theologians admit, was unknown to the ancient Church. But besides all this, the eternal untruth of this theory, in itself, is manifest. The theory, that because a doctrine and an organization centre in a certain place (the See of Rome), they are divine, is a complete inversion of sound logic. It is not the place which can give the stamp to religion, but the religion which must give stamp and character to the place.

5. *The Essential Character of Protestantism.*[1]

So far we have been dwelling on the negative side of Protestantism. We will now look at it in its essence and positive character. It emanates from the need of salvation and the sense of that need. It does not consist simply in a protest against human authority in matters of faith. The history of the origin of the name Protestant (1529 at the Diet of Spires) shows that it was more than this. Its essence supremely consists in the position on which that protest rests. It answers the question put to the sinner who yearns for salvation, answers with the truth, that *salvation is in Christ alone, "solus Christus, sola gratia,"* Christ the only one, grace the only thing. Subjectively stated, this is the doctrine of *justification by faith alone.* This is the *material* principle of Protestantism, i. e., it forms the great central matter about which it gathers.

The question now arises: By what principle of cognition does Protestantism reach this principle in results? The answer is, on the grounds that the only secure, authentic, and, consequently, absolutely authoritative witness in regard to this salvation of Christ, is given in the

[1] Compare the *Manuscript Lectures* of Dr. Krauth.

Scriptures and nowhere else. This is the *formal* principle of Protestantism, i. e. that which pertains to the form, shape, or manner, in which the matter or *material* principle is reached.

We ask, what comes, what is the matter that comes? The answer is, *Christ, faith, justification,* is the *matter.* We ask, in what form and how it comes? The answer is, in *revelation.* When the *formal* principle of Protestantism is asserted without its *material* principle, it runs into Sectarianism, Negativism, Rationalism and Pseudo-protestant heresy in general. The assertion of the *formal* principle without reaching the *material* principle of Protestantism, may run out into abuses which genuine Protestantism would consider worse than Romanism itself. No men assert the *formal* principle of Protestantism more vigorously, and indeed with the claim that they alone assert it consistently, than the very men who use the *formal* principle to overthrow the *material,* men who abuse the rule of faith, to undermine faith itself.

The material principle is the end, the formal principle is the means, and it is the end alone which gives value to the means. The man who uses his Bible as to fail to reach its material, i. e. its faith, is worse off than if he never had opened the Bible, and the sincere, ignorant, deluded Romanist will rise up in judgment against him.

When as Lutherans we call ourselves *Protestants,* we use a name which belonged exclusively to us originally, and it continued to be the diplomatic name of our Church till the peace of Westphalia, 1648,— and in fact, in European usage, is, to a large extent, still confined to our Church. We are Protestants in the historical sense of the word in which it asserts not a mere neg-

ation of a false rule of faith, nor the mere theoretical acceptance of a true rule of faith, but two conjoining things,— the *formal* rule of the faith and the *material* faith of the rule. This is the Protestantism we defend over against the Church of Rome. This is the only Protestantism that can successfully be so defended, and the argument of Rome over against a great deal that calls itself Protestantism is as much our argument as hers.[1] On the most vital points, the very center of the life of Christianity, such as the doctrine of the Trinity, of the true Deity of Christ, of the Incarnation, the Atonement, the objective character of the two Sacraments, true Protestantism stands with Romanism, or rather, with the Church Universal, over against the spurious systems which call themselves Protestant, but which are erroneous in various degrees, till they sink in their lowest grade to what is essentially Pagan.

MARTENSEN[2] says: "Inasmuch as both confessions (Catholic and Protestant) profess a general belief in God as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; inasmuch as both reject the ancient and modern forms of Naturalism and Rationalism, both recognize the truth that the Christian Church rests upon a Divine Word, derived from the Founder himself, and delivered to the Church through the apostles. For it is only through the apostles that we have received Christianity, and that Christianity *only* is genuine, which can show itself to be *apostolic*. The difference between the confessions does not consist merely in the difference of the relation which they assign the oral and written word of the apostles (tra-

[1] In the *Canons* of the Council of Trent (1545—1563), in which the so-called Protestant views are condemned, the Protestant doctrines are almost always presented in an exaggerated form, and mixed up with real heresies, which true Protestantism condemns as emphatically as the Church of Rome.

[2] See his *Dogmatics*, §20, pp. 25, 26.

dition and Scripture), but in their different views respecting the scope of the apostolate. The Catholic Church holds to a living apostolate in the Church, perpetuating itself through all time, — an inspiration constantly kept up in the representatives of the Church... The Evangelical Lutheran Church, like the Catholic, confesses that the Spirit of the Lord is with the Church unto the end of the world, leading it into all truth; but that perfect union of the Spirit of God and man, which is called Inspiration, and which constitutes the essence of the apostolate, it assigns exclusively to the beginning of the Church, to the period of its foundation; and, although it admits the relative validity of tradition, it yet regards the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament as the only perfect, authentic, and absolutely canonical expression of the original fulness of the apostolic spirit.

But the difference here indicated rests on another which lies still deeper — a difference in the conception of the essential character of Christianity itself. The Evangelical Lutheran Church views Christianity as a Gospel; as glad tidings of the new life and the new creation in Christ, offered to men as a free gift of heavenly grace; whereas the Catholic Church for the most part regards faith as a new law, and Christ as a new lawgiver, representing the Gospel merely as an external authority to which the believer must yield."

Again[1]: "It has often been said that the principle of Protestantism is that of *subjectivity* — a proposition which, expressed in this indefinite, general form, is liable to misconception. The aim of the Reformation was as much to regain objective Christianity, to separate the true tradition from the false or at least human traditions, as to revive subjective, personal Christian-

[1] *Dogmatics*, §21, pp. 30, 31.

ity. What the Reformation desired was neither exclusively the objective nor the subjective; it was the free union of the objective and subjective, of the thing believed, and the person believing, of divine revelation and the religious self-consciousness. This free union of the objective and the subjective the Evangelical Church claims to have secured through its so-called formal and material principles, which express the two sides, the objective and the subjective side, of the same truth. By the term formal principle, is meant the Holy Scriptures as the only source of doctrine; by the term material principle, is meant justification by faith. On a correct apprehension of these principles, often misunderstood and often feebly stated, depends a correct understanding of Protestantism."

Martensen further remarks[1]: "Where there is freedom, there are also abuses of freedom. The Roman Church seemingly knows of no such state of disintegration and confusion as do the Protestant Churches. The principle of authority throws a veil over the secret iniquity, the secret unbelief and doubt, that shelter themselves within the Church under the forms of external acquiescence.

In the Protestant Churches, on the contrary, all these defects are manifest. Many members of the Protestant Churches, weary of the abuses of the principles of freedom, are seized with a longing for a tradition which shall have absolute authority. This security they seek sometimes in the *consensus* of the first three centuries, sometimes of the first five or six centuries. 'A Catholic current' says Geiger (d. 1843), 'is passing through the world.' This *Catholic current* will become more and more noticeable, the nearer the time of the great

[1] See §24, pp. 48, 49.

religious movements and crises approaches. But to lay down a tradition which shall make superfluous all internal struggles for freedom is impossible. The various manifestations of sympathy with Romanism, exhibited of late, may be of use in awakening what in many has been slumbering, viz., an appreciation of the importance of the Church and what has been handed down in the Church, as the natural connecting link between faith and the Bible. But, whenever these sympathies have turned in antipathy to the principles and inmost essence of the Reformation, they lead, as various facts have within a few years shown, to *Rome,* and to a repose in the spurious guarantees there offered."

In this connection DR. KRAUTH remarks[1]: "If it be true, as Geiger says, 'that a Catholic current is passing through the world,' it is no less true, that under this current, at the surface, there is a deep swell of Protestantism which is upheaving Romanism itself, and paradoxial as it may seem, we do not hesitate to state our conviction, that the current of Catholicism is set in motion by the current of Protestantism. How else can we account for it, that just in the most thoroughly Protestant of Protestant countries, England and the United States, the tendency shows itself most strongly, and next to these countries, in the most intensely Protestant parts of Germany. Protestantism is so essentially a quickener, that it whips into activity its own antagonists. It is so scientific, that it teaches its enemies; it is so progressive, that it sets even false conservatism in motion. Hence we see the anomaly, that in Italy, the most Romish of countries, Romanism is torpid, ignorant, and so hampered with its own traditionary abuses, that it is at once powerless and de-

[1] See his *Manuscript Lectures.*

tested, while in the United States it is vigorous, decisive, aggressive and prosperous. The secret of it is, that Romanism is compelled to be protestantized, as far as its nature allows, and its greatest defenders in our own times have defended it with the stolen weapons of Protestant science, and the thing they defend is Romanism purified of some of its worst features by the mighty work of Protestant ideas. The Reformation did not carry out of the Church of Rome the entire reformatory tendency. As the Reformation was the result of tendencies which grew within the Church of the West, side by side with Papacy, so did the leaven which revealed itself in it, still in some measure remain in the Church of Rome. Two tendencies have worked without interruption within the Romish Church ever since. We see their struggles at the council of Trent, we see it in the conflicts of the Jansenists and Jesuits, we see it in Ultramontanism and its antagonistic force; we see it in noble men who in time of apostasy of nominal Protestants in the great rationalistic defection, gave illustration of the truth that even in Rome God preserves his witnesses. The Church of Rome is destined, we believe, in the flight of ages, for one of two consummations. She is destined either by the grace of God to purge off her corruption as a body, and thus give historic completeness to the Reformation; or to see a second schism produced by her own obstinacy, which will again, as in the sixteenth century, rob her of her noblest children and her most glorious lands."

§ 11. Lutheran Protestantism.

The *material* principle of Lutheran Protestantism is the saving truth of Christianity as it lies in the fundamental doctrine of justification

by faith alone. The *formal* principle is the sole authority of Holy Scripture. With these is connected the historic testimony of the Church as the living witness of the truth. This testimony is united with the material and formal principle, and the resultant of the union is the individual Christian assurance of faith.

The Protestantism of the Reformed or Calvinistic Churches, on the other hand, has laid as its fundamental doctrine, the absolute and sole primary causality of God, and holding with the Lutheran Church, that Holy Scripture alone is normative, has yet isolated Scripture from the historic development of the Church (*Luthardt*).

1. *The distinction between Lutheran and Reformed Protestantism.*

This distinction has, in recent times, been stated in manifold ways. GOEBEL, NITZSCH, and HEPPE stated it as this: In Reformed Protestantism more stress is laid on the intellect, in Lutheranism on the emotions; in Reformed Protestantism the formal principle is predominant, and Scripture is regarded more as the exclusive source of doctrine; while in Lutheranism the material principle rules, and the formal principle is regarded more as merely the norm of the doctrine which grows out of the analogy of faith, in consequence of which the pure tradition possesses in Lutheranism a greater validity, i. e., the tradition which involves the handing down of truth in the Church.

While the Lutheran Church concedes no authority to opinions which have been transmitted from generation to generation, it values them as witnesses of the ob-

vious and true sense of God's Word. That Word is the sole authority, but there is always a moral weight of presumption, which needs to be distinctly met and accounted for, if its validity be denied in the general understanding of that Word—the impression which it made at the beginning and has made through all time. The Romish tradition, i. e., the authority outside of the Word, and often really opposed to it, our Church rejects; but exegetical tradition and the doctrines which rest upon it, if they bear the test of the just interpretation of God's Word, our Church greatly esteems; she does not believe that God has forsaken his Church, that for ages together there has been no witness to the truth in her,—that would be to acknowledge that the gates of hell have prevailed against her. Whenever a new interpretation, opposed to one universally received, has been offered, our Church has regarded it as necessary for the discoverer or inventor of the view, not only to show that it is as probable theoretically as the older one, but that it is more probable (KRAUTH).

HERZOG says: "Lutheran Protestantism is the antithesis of the Judaism of the Romish Church, which has imparted to her doctrine a gnosticizing tincture; the Reformed Protestantism is in opposition to the Paganism of the Church of Rome, by which the doctrine obtained a Judaizing, ethical character." SCHWEIZER says: "Reformed Protestantism is the protestation against all deification of the creature, and is, consequently, the emphasizing of the absoluteness of God and of the exclusiveness of his will; this forms its material principle, with which is connected its positive normal principle, viz., the exclusive maintenance of Scripture as the Rule of faith." In a similar strain DORNER says: "The material principle of Zwingli is

the glory of God; his formal principle is the Scripture, but accepted in such a sense as to make the internal word independent of the external, and so as to deny all creaturely causality on the part of the creature in salvation." BAUR says: "The Reformed system goes from above downward, the Lutheran from below upward, i. e., the one begins with God and reasons out and down to man, the other begins with man and reasons up to God." On the other hand SCHNECKENBURGER says: "The distinction between the systems consists, not in the predominance of *theology* or *anthropology*, of the absolute idea of God or of the subjective consciousness of salvation, but in the diverse form of the consciousness of salvation itself, in consequence of which the Reformed theology went back to the eternal decree; the Lutheran Church, on the other hand, being satisfied with justification by faith." STAHL, approximating more closely with the view of Schweizer, finds in the "sole causality," which is the notion of the Godhead, the controlling principle of the Reformed doctrine, and its character he finds in the mode of thinking, which is adverse to mysteries. "The whole Reformed Church development is, on the one side, determined by this impulse against mysteries, which impulse concedes no instrumental distribution of grace (an aspect derived from Zwingli); on the other side, it is distinguished by the evangelical theocratical tendency, the glorifying of God in the congregation (an aspect proceeding from Calvin)." MARTENSEN says: "The Swiss Reformation started primarily from the formal principle, that of the authority of the Scriptures; whereas the Lutheran originated more especially in the material principle, in the depths of the Christian consciousness, in an experience of sin and redemption."... "The Lu-

theran Reformation manifested the greatest caution in regard to tradition, and observed the principle of rejecting nothing that could be reconciled with Scripture; whereas the Swiss Reformation introduced in many respects a direct opposition between the biblical and ecclesiastic, and in several particulars followed the principle that all ecclesiastical institutions should be rejected unless they could be deduced from the letter of the Bible."... "The Reformed Church, although vigorously protesting against the legal Church of Rome, is nevertheless infected with the legal spirit, whereas the germ of the fulness of the Gospel is found in Lutheranism."

LUTHARDT says: "All these diverse definitions involve the common theory that the difference between the Churches is not merely an external one, does not turn merely upon different doctrines, e. g., the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, but is a difference running completely through them, a difference in principle. An essential element of the difference consists in the momenta, or elements, of the Reformed doctrine reciprocally conditioning each other,—on the one side, the absolute causality and sole primary causality of God, which excludes the means of grace in the proper sense; on the other side, the assurance of a condition of salvation, grounded in an inscrutable decree, an assurance reached by the individual's actual life as the result of the divine operation."

2. *The material and formal principle of Lutheranism.*

This, according to DORNER, expressed in 1841 and in a somewhat different shape and in a more correct one in his "History of Protestant Theology" in 1867, is another way of expressing "the distinction between

Christian subjectivity and Christian objectivity." "The Scripture presents the objective original Christianity;" "the material principle is that faith in which the truth, set forth in Scripture, obtains a free internal existence."

"But," says LUTHARDT, "the material principle is not the subjective assurance of salvation, or the consciousness of faith, or anything of that sort, but designates the actual substance of the salvation itself, a salvation testified of in Scripture, acknowledged by the Church, assured to believers in faith. The formal principle, on the other hand, designates the authentic witnessing of salvation as it has actualized itself in the historical revelation, and is, consequently, the norm of every announcement of salvation made to the Church."

3. *The Material Principle of Lutheranism.*

The material principle of our Church is *the doctrine of justification by faith* regarded on its two sides: 1) That salvation or justification is in Jesus Christ, the Mediator; 2) That faith is the way of salvation. This forms the soul of the Lutheran Confession, and may be expressed indirectly or directly.

1. *Indirectly.* It may be expressed either in the *objective* or *subjective* form. In the indirect *objective* form the statement of the *sole mediatorship* or *sole glory of Christ* is made prominent. Over against the Romish doctrine, which lessens the glory of Christ, the *Apology* says[1]: "We are disputing concerning a great

[1] See *Book of Concord*, or the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, with Historical Introduction, Notes, Appendices, Indices. Translated and edited by Henry E. Jacobs, D.D. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1882—83. We always quote from this edition, giving paging of first volume. All questions from *A. C.* (*i. e.* Augsburg Confession), *Apol.* (*i. e.* Apology), *Smal. Art.* (*i. e.* Smalcald Articles), Smaller or Larger Catechism, and *F. C.* (*i. e.* Formula of Concord), are from this edition.

subject, concerning the honor of Christ, and whence good minds may seek for sure and firm consolation, whether it is to be placed in confidence in Christ, or in our works" (p. 109, $_{35}$). Again: "The adversaries teach that men merit the remission of sins by love to God, prior to grace. But this also is to remove 'the foundation,' i. e., Christ" (p. 166, $_{21}$).

In the indirect *subjective* form the statement is, that *faith is the only possible mode of appropriating salvation.* The *Apology* says: "The promise of Christ cannot be received, unless by faith" (p. 92, $_{50}$); "The promise of Christ is necessary. But this cannot be received except by faith" (p. 95, $_{70}$); "For the promise of God's mercy, reconciliation and love towards us, is not apprehended unless by faith" (p. 158, $_{260}$); "Christ is not apprehended as a Mediator, except by faith. Therefore, *by faith alone we obtain remission of sins,* when we comfort our hearts with confidence in the mercy promised for Christ's sake" (p. 97, $_{80}$). This faith is defined as "the *special* faith (by which an individual believes that, for Christ's sake, his sins are remitted him, and, that, for Christ's sake, God is reconciled and propitious), which obtains remission of sins and justifies us" (p. 91, $_{45}$).

II. *Directly.* Directly the doctrine of justification by faith is regarded as the *principle and fundamental article.* "It is necessary that the chiefest point of all the Gospel should be holden fast, that we do freely obtain grace, by faith in Christ" *(A. C.* XVIII, p. 65, $_{52}$); "Who does not see that this article, that by faith we obtain remission of sins, is most true, most certain, and especially necessary to all Christians?" *(Apol.* p. 160, $_{277}$). The *Smalcald Articles* emphatically say: "Of this article nothing can be yielded or surrendered, even though

heaven and earth and all things should sink to ruin... And upon this article all things depend, which, against the Pope, the devil and the whole world, we teach and practice. Therefore we must be sure concerning this doctrine, and not doubt; for otherwise all is lost, and the Pope and devil and all things against us gain the victory and suit" (p. 312, $_{5}$).

Consequently all the particular doctrines are judged of from this, as the central point. We will quote a few passages from the *Smalcald Articles:* "It (the doctrine of the Mass) directly and powerfully conflicts with this chief article" (p. 312, 313, $_{1}$); "For it (the doctrine of purgatory) conflicts with the first article which teaches that only Christ, and not the works of men, can help souls" (p. 314, 315, $_{12}$); "All of which (the granting of indulgences) is not to be borne, because it is without the word of God, and without necessity, and is not commanded, but conflicts with the chief article (p. 316, $_{24}$). In the *Formula of Concord* we find this statement: "This article concerning Justification by Faith is the chief in the entire Christian doctrine, without which no poor conscience has any firm consolation, or can know aright the riches of the grace of Christ, as Dr. Luther also has written: 'If only this article remain in view pure, the Christian Church also remains pure, and is harmonious and without all sects; but if it do not remain pure, it is not possible to resist any error or fanatical spirit'" (p. 571, $_{6}$).

4. *The Formal Principle of Lutheranism.*

The doctrine of the exclusive normative authority of the Holy Scriptures is not distinctly expressed in a distinct article, either of the *Augsburg Confession* or of the *Apology*, but it is presupposed throughout and

is indeed actually asserted incidentally in various places. In the Preface to the *Augsburg Confession* we read: "We now offer in the matter of Religion this Confession...the doctrine of which is derived from the Holy Scriptures and the pure Word of God" (p. 34, $_{8}$). In the *Apology* it is laid down as a thing beyond appeal that as the Scripture does not teach the invocation of saints, the conscience can have nothing to assure of the propriety of such invocations, and the question is asked, "How do we know that God approves of this invocation? Whence do we know without the testimony of Scripture, that the saints perceive the prayers of any one?" And the statement is made, "since the invocation does not have a testimony from God's Word, it cannot be affirmed that the saints perceive our invocation"; "there ought to be a Word of God" *(Apol.,* p. 236, $_{11, 12}$; p. 237, $_{17}$). The same principle is distinctly asserted in the *Smalcald Articles* (p. 315, $_{15}$): "It is of no consequence that articles of faith are framed from the works or words of Holy Fathers."... "We have, moreover, another rule, viz., that the Word of God should frame articles of faith; otherwise no one, not even an angel."

Nowhere, however, is the formal principle more distinctly and clearly asserted than in the *Introduction to the Formula of Concord* (p. 491, $_{1}$): "We believe, teach and confess that the only rule and standard according to which at once all dogmas and teachers should be esteemed and judged are nothing else than the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the New Testament, as it is written (Ps. 119: 105): 'Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and light unto my path'; and St. Paul (Gal. 1: 8): 'Though an angel from heaven should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we

preached unto you, let him be anathema.' ". At the close of this same *Introduction* (p. 492, $_{7}$) it says: "The Holy Scriptures alone remain the only judge, rule, and standard, according to which, as the only test-stone, all dogmas should and must be discerned and judged, as to whether they be good or evil, true or false." In the *Formula of Concord* (p. 535, $_{3}$) the Holy Scriptures are called "the pure and clear fountains, which are the only true standard whereby to judge all teachers and doctrines."

With reference to the relation of the "Confessions" themselves to Scripture, this distinct statement is made in the *Introduction to the Formula of Concord* (p. 491, $_{2}$): "Other writings, of ancient and modern teachers, whatever reputation they may have, should not be regarded as of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures, but should altogether be subordinated to them, and should not be received other or further than as witnesses, in what manner and at what places, since the time of the apostles, the purer doctrine of the prophets and apostles was preserved."

5. *The Historical Character of Lutheran Protestantism.*[1]

Lutheran Protestantism is pre-eminently historical. It approves of the connection with the traditions of the Church, i. e., of the visible transmission of doctrines and usages, so far as they are not in conflict with the letter or spirit of God's Word. Pseudo-Protestantism starts practically with the assumption that everything in the visible Church, both of doctrine and of practice, is to be regarded as wrong, till it shall be proved by direct testimony of Scripture to be right. True Protestantism, i. e., Lutheran Protestantism, starts on the

[1] Compare *Manuscript Lectures* of Dr. Krauth.

assumption that everything in the visible Church, both of doctrine and of practice, is to be regarded as right, until it shall be proved by testimony of Scripture, or by sanctified reason, to be wrong. The *Augsburg Confession* and *Apology,* therefore, frequently present the testimony of the Church *(tota ecclesia)* together with the testimony of the Scripture, and seek to establish the harmony of the Protestant doctrine with the scriptural tradition or transmission of the Church universal, and of the pure Roman Church or Western division of the Universal Church. Thus in the *Augsburg Confession,* at the close of the Doctrinal Articles, it is said: "This is about the sum of doctrine among us, in which can be seen that there is nothing which is discrepant with the Scriptures, or with the Church Catholic, or even with the Roman Church, so far as that Church is known from the writings of the Fathers" *(Book of Concord,* p. 47, $_{1}$). At the close of the *Articles on Abuses* we also have this statement: "These things have been enumerated...that it might be understood, that in doctrine and ceremonials among us there is nothing received contrary to Scripture or to the Universal Christian Church, inasmuch as it is manifest that we have diligently taken heed that no new and godless doctrines should creep into our Churches" (p. 67, $_{8}$).

In consonance with this it is said, "the Mass is retained still among us, and celebrated with great reverence; yea, and almost all the ceremonies are in use" *(A. C.* XXIV., p. 50, $_{1, 2}$). By the "Mass" is here meant the administration of the Lord's Supper, or the Communion Service, and by the customary "ceremonies in use" are meant those ceremonies which have been used in the Church. Whenever, over against corruption of

predominant doctrinal practice, our Church receives the scriptural doctrine, she declares that in this she brings forth "nothing new." In the *Apology* it is said: "For this reason, our preachers have diligently taught concerning these subjects, and have delivered nothing that is new, but have set forth Holy Scripture and the judgment of the Holy Fathers" (p. 83, $_{50}$). The *Catalogue of Testimonies,* added in the best editions of our Symbolical Books[1] to article VIII of the *Formula of Concord,* shows that the Christian Church has continually held the doctrine set forth in that article.

The judgment of our Church in regard to pure transmission of *tradition* is of the highest importance. It is sustained by the Scripture view of the Church. The Church is the pillar and ground of the truth; she is as really God's work, as God's Word is, and as the defects of particular parts of the Church are no evidence against the infallibility of the Word of God, as a rule of faith, so also these defects are no evidence against the infallibility of the Church of God. We maintain as inflexibly as the Church of Rome does, the infallibility of the Church Catholic, that is to say, we hold that there has been and always will be upon earth a communion of saints, in which the pure faith, which makes the Christian foundation, abides. We hold, also, that there has been a time, when in *every* part of the visible Church a man was bound in conscience to false doctrine,—that even in the Church of the West, the Romish Church in her darkest hour,—the official creeds of the Church to which her children were bound in conscience set forth only pure truths. When Luther grasped the great truths out of which the Reformation arose, he found and grasped them in the creed which

[1] See *Book of Concord* (Jacobs). Vol. 2, pp. 272—293.

had been from time immemorial in the Church,—"I believe in the forgiveness of sins." The Reformers within the Church of Rome set forth no doctrine which they could not conscientiously, as faithful children of that Church, set forth. When we now take up the Confessions of the Church of Rome, we find, that until the Council of Trent (1545—63), which was not held till after the Reformation was established, the only creeds of the Church were the *Apostles'*, the *Nicene,* and the *Athanasian* Creeds, to which our Reformers inflexibly held. Up to the time of the Reformation the doctrine confessed in the œcumenical or general creeds was the same throughout the Church Catholic, east and west. The Augsburg Confession is the oldest distinctive creed used in any large portion of Christendom. So far as the Roman or Greek Churches have creeds older than the Augsburg Confession, they set forth none other than the doctrines we hold in common with them. Luther well argues, then, that we are the true old Church, because we hold to the true old Creeds. When the *Augsburg Confession* was set forth in 1530, it was an ampler statement and larger development of the same old doctrine of the Church. We do not contend that all its specifications are in the older creeds any more than we pretend that all specifications of the *Nicene Creed* are in the *Apostles'* Creed, or that all the specifications of the *Athanasian* are in the *Nicene.* But the *Augsburg Confession* is a pure statement of the doctrine of the Church Catholic, in its legitimate development for more than fifteen hundred years, and is related logically to the purified Protestantism of the sixteenth century as the *Apostles'* and *Nicene* Creeds are related to the Catholic doctrine of the Middle Ages.

6. *The Internal Assurance of Salvation.*

The truths of salvation concerning justification by faith, such as the Holy Scriptures testify, and the pure Church of all ages has confessed, are sealed by the Holy Spirit internally in Christians, especially in that comfort of conscience which the Word of God brings with it.

This element is made very prominent, especially in the *Apology,* where the thought is often repeated that "Justification by faith" brings "a sure and firm consolation to pious minds." In Art. IV *(On Justification)* we read (p. 98, $_{85}$): "Wherefore let not good minds suffer themselves to be forced from the opinion, that we receive remission of sins for Christ's sake only through faith. In this they have sure and firm consolation against the terrors of sin, and against eternal death, and against all the gates of hell." Again (p. 103, $_{117, 118}$): "We have shown with sufficient fulness, both from testimonies of Scripture, and arguments derived from Scripture, that by faith alone we obtain the remission of sins for Christ's sake, and that by faith alone we are justified... But how necessary the knowledge of this faith is, can be easily judged, because in this alone the office of Christ is recognized, by this alone we receive the benefits of Christ; this alone brings sure and firm consolation to pious minds. And in the Church it is necessary that there should be doctrine, from which the pious may receive the sure hope of salvation." And so in many other places in the Apology. In the Smalcald Articles we have this clear testimony (p. 346, $_{44}$): "The doctrine of repentance has been utterly corrupted by the Pope and his adherents. For they teach that sins are remitted because of the worth of our works. Then they bid us

doubt whether the remission occur. They nowhere teach us that sins are remitted freely for Christ's sake, and that by this faith we obtain remission of sins. Thus they obscure the glory of Christ, and deprive consciences of firm consolation, and abolish true divine services, viz., the exercises of faith struggling with unbelief and despair concerning the promise of the Gospel."

The consciousness of this union with Christ gives assurance of salvation. LUTHER: "By faith thou art so united to Christ that of thee and him there becomes, as it were, one person, so that with confidence thou canst say: I am Christ,—that is, Christ's righteousness and victory are mine; and Christ in turn can say: I am that sinner,—that is, his sins and death are mine, because he clings to me and abides in me and I abide in him, for we have been united through faith into one flesh and bone."

Here belongs also the *testimony of the Holy Spirit,* which is an internal (personal) assurance of salvation, wrought in the believer by the Holy Ghost, through the Word. The ground of faith is the external word of promise; the ground of assurance is the inward witness of the Spirit that we fulfil the conditions of the promise (Rom. 8: 16; 1 John 4: 13; 5: 10). This witness of the Spirit is not a new and direct revelation from God, but a strengthening of previously existing faith until he who possesses this faith becomes certain that he possesses it. Faith should be distinguished not only from assurance, but also from the feeling of joy, because true faith is possible without assurance of salvation; for those who already believed are urged to seek for assurance (Heb. 6: 11; Rom. 4: 20, 21; 2 Pet. 1: 10) and are to be filled with joy (Rom. 15: 13; John

16: 24; Phil. 1: 25), for as faith increases, so assurance and joy increase.[1]

[1] This evidence drawn from Christian experience based upon the Christian's regeneration and sanctification has gained great prominence in all modern apologetical and dogmatic discussions. Among recent German theologians it has received special attention from DORNER and FRANK. The presentation by Dorner in his *System of Christian Doctrine* (Vol. I., pp. 31—184), is worthy of most careful study, and especially valuable in his searching criticism of Frank's *System der Christlichen Gewissheit*, as well as of his *System der Christlichen Wahrheit*, two of the most profound and important works on theology produced in the last half of the 19th century. Dorner maintains that Frank's foundation of his *System of Certainty* is too subjective, and has too great a resemblance to the method of Schleiermacher. The position of Dorner may be seen from the following citation: "God must be by logical necessity the ultimate guarantee and source of all true certainty; it is not our frail condition of belief, our righteous but subjective nature, which is the ultimate source of our certainty of God and Christ. There is an immediate knowledge of God, and not merely a secondary knowledge produced by inference from effect to cause. We Christians know ourselves, as Paul frequently assures us (1 Cor. 8: 3; Gal. 4: 9), as partakers of salvation, inasmuch as we are known of God, and we know ourselves as thus known. So it also happens, according to John, with reference to Christian certainty, that we are certain of something objective, of communion with Christ, of Christ for us, and of Christ abiding in us (1 John 3: 24; 5: 6). We are not first certain of God by being conscious of ourselves (as regenerate and converted); but experienceing and knowing God in Christ as being for us, we know ourselves as redeemed. The condition of the believer, and its certainty, does not come about in this way, that we feel ourselves to be regenerate and children of God, but we first experience the gracious regard of God, who shows himself to us as our Father in Christ, and now we cry, 'Abba, dear Father', and know—for this reason, that he has announced himself to us as a Father in the Son—ourselves to be his children." *(System of Christian Doctrine*, Vol. I., pp. 55, 56.)

PHILIPPI would have us regard "the objective atonement wrought out by Christ, attested and offered by the Word of God, as alike the startening-point and the only rock on which the Evangelical Christian bases his assurance of salvation" (Vol. 2, p. 58, 2nd ed.) in place of the subjective regeneration,—but Frank defends his position both against the searching criticism of Philippi and Dorner, and maintains that "the special moral experience which underlies the Christian certainty, is that of regeneration and conversion, a transformation of the man's moral state of life." *(System of Christian Certainty*, pp. 108—122.) We would in this connection recommend for careful reading Stearns' *Evidence of Christian Certainty* (New York, 1892), which, in a certain sense, may be

III. THE METHOD OF DOGMATICS.

§ 12. The Formation of the Dogmatic System.

The Material Principle of Protestantism in the unity of its objective and subjective sides, forms the genetic principle of the unfolding of the Dogmatic System, and the Holy Scriptures, as the original record of the revelation of salvation, forms the normative argumentative proof for the single statements of Dogmatics.

1. *The Material Principle of Dogmatics.*

As Dogmatics is designed to be a systematic statement of the Christian Faith, it must genetically unfold the entire Christian Doctrine, out of a fundamental unity. By a genetic unfolding we mean one that presents the process of originating the natural mode of development, in which, as it were, the secondary truths grow out of the primary. There must be some one germ, which grows and expands into all that follows. As such a genetic principle Luther designates the article of *Justification by faith:* "In it we have the sum of the whole Christian Doctrine and the bright and lovely sun, which illumines the Christian communion. If this article be embraced and retained with a sure and firm faith, all the others gradually come from it and follow it, as for example, the doctrine of the Trinity and others"... "While this doctrine stands, the Church stands." And the meaning of Luther's expression that it is "the article of a standing or falling

regarded as an original reproduction of Frank's *System der Christlichen Gewissheit*, of which later work one volume has appeared in English, under the title of *System of the Christian Certainty* (Edinburgh, 1886).

church," is, that while this doctrine stands, the Church stands, when it falls, the Church falls.

The Dogmaticians subsequent to Luther did not always carry out this thought completely. They designate the Scripture as the only principle of knowledge, and the later Dogmaticians, who pursued the analytic method, regarded the idea of salvation as a controlling point of view, but beyond this regarded the *analogy or rule of faith,* only as a material canon.

The most recent Dogmaticians, for the most part, start with the idea of fellowship with God through Christ (Thomasius, Hofmann), or with the idea of Atonement (Philippi).

LUTHARDT says: The material principle of Dogmatics must be the essence of Christianity itself, i. e., the fellowship with God through Christ, which is actualized in the righteousness of faith as a righteousness of life. This material principle is to be exhibited in accordance with its entire contents through the conjoined operation of the three factors of Dogmatics: 1) The Scripture; 2) The Doctrine of the Church; 3) The personal consciousness of faith.

2. *The Scriptures as the Normative factor of Dogmatics.*

The Holy Scriptures as the normative factor in the Dogmatic System imparts to it its biblical character. The ground of this its authority for Dogmatics lies in this, that Scripture is the authentic original record of divine revelation, and as such the Christian is certain of its truth. Since the time of Gerhard the Dogmaticians present in their *Prolegomena,* the complete doctrine of Scripture, as the only principle by which we become cognizant of heavenly truth. Inspiration forms

the basis for the authority of Holy Scripture, which witnesses of itself through the *testimony of the Holy Spirit,* i. e., the internal actual assurance which the matter of Scripture itself imparts.[1] In the later Dogmaticians we have presented, in place of the testimony of the Holy Spirit, the credibility of the authors. In

[1] To the Reformers the inspired Word of God was the one authority, the sole rule of faith and practice. They recognized Christianity as consisting not only in a revelation made long ago, but also in the present power of God by which the facts and truths thus revealed are brought to bear upon the hearts of men. To Luther the Bible is not a dead letter, but the Word of God which is quick and powerful because it is the instrument in the hands of the present, life-giving Spirit. Our Dogmaticians argued somewhat as follows: We receive the Scriptures as true because God is the author and speaks to us in and through them. We know that they are the Word of God because the same Spirit who inspired their writers and speaks to us through their pages witnesses in our souls to their truth. The appeal is to the inward witness of the Spirit, the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti internum.* The unregenerate man does not possess this witness. His reason is darkened so that he cannot discern the divine power that is at work in the Scriptures. In the regenerate soul this darkness is removed by the illuminating influence of the Holy Spirit, so that it recognizes the presence of the Spirit in the Word, and knows it to be true and divine. Thus God himself vouches for the truth of the Scriptures.

But this evidence of Christian Experience was not yet stated in its completeness, or with a distinct recognition of its far-reaching character. The inward witness of the Spirit is valid evidence so far as it goes. But there still lies something deeper. This is but a part of the evidence of Christian experience. The divine faith, the spiritual illumination, through which the Christian is convinced of the truth and divinity of the Scriptures, needs a deeper grounding. The questions arise: How do we know that this is the work of the Spirit? How do we know that the Holy Spirit acts upon our souls at all? How do we know that Christianity is a present divine power? The answer is: The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God (Rom. 8: 16); in other words, the evidence of the reality and truth of Christianity and of the divine record of salvation given in the Bible, has for its root the evidence that the believer is a child of God. The witness of the Spirit to the believer's sonship and the witness of the Spirit to the divinity and truth of the Scriptures are at the root one, two parts of that one powerful influence of the Spirit upon the believer's soul which is the great present proof of the reality of Christianity. (After Stearns's *Evidence of Christian Experience,* pp. 386—389.)

this way all attacks upon the Bible become in their actual working, attacks upon religion itself.

Lessing appealed to the self-assurance of Christian experience. SCHLEIERMACHER, in his views, follows Lessing, inasmuch as he makes a primary point of the Christian's internal consciousness, and consequently does not treat the doctrine of Scripture in his *Prolegomena,* but in the body of his work, in which he says (*Glbsl.* § 128): "The authority of the Holy Scriptures cannot be the basis of faith in Christ; on the contrary, this faith must previously exist before we can concede to the Holy Scriptures a special authority." TWESTEN says (I, 283): "It should not be maintained that in the Christian consciousness, faith in the Holy Scriptures is that foundation which is fixed in itself as the foundation of all other convictions,— since faith in the Holy Scriptures is rather only one constituent of the Christian conviction, which is to be apprehended only by faith, and just as much requires to be stayed and supported by the other doctrines, as they require to be stayed and supported by it."

A system of Dogmatics assumes Scripture and its authority as a matter of fact, (just at it takes the Church and her doctrines), to justify both within its system, as it does the other facts of faith.

3. *The Canon of Scripture.*

The body of the sacred writings is comprehended in the *Canon,* and hence they are called "the Canonical Scriptures." The word *kanon* in classical Greek meant 1) properly a *straight rod,* or a carpenter's rule; 2) then a *testing rule* in ethics, or in art, or language. The ecclesiastical usage of the word offers a complete parallel to the classical. In the New Testament it occurs four times (Gal. 6: 16; 2 Cor. 10: 13—16). In the first pas-

sage (Gal. 6: 16) it is used in its literal sense of rule, and in the second passage the change from an active to a passive sense is worthy of notice. In patristic writings the word is commonly used both as "a rule" in the widest sense, and especially in the phrases "the rule of the Church," "the rule of faith," "the rule of truth." In the fourth century, when the practice of the Church was systematized, the decisions of synods were styled "Canons." As applied to Scripture the derivatives of the word *Canon* are used long before the simple word. The first direct application of the term *kanon* to the Scriptures seems to be by AMPHILOCHIUS, bishop of Iconium, a contemporary of Gregory of Nazianzus, who concludes his well-known Catalogue of the Scriptures (about 380 A. D.), with the words, "this will be the most truthful Canon of the inspired Scriptures." Among Latin writers the word is commonly found from the time of JEROME.[1]

a) *The Old Testament Canon.*[2] The formation of the Old Testament Canon was a matter of internal necessity when the Old Testament time of Revelation came to an end. According to the Rabbinical tradition it was the work of Ezra and the great Synagogue. It first appears as a finished whole in the prologue to the

[1] For a fuller discussion of the use of the word *Canon* see Westcott's Article on the *Canon* in Smith's *Bible Dict.* (Amer. Ed., 4 vols.). The same author in his work *On the Canon of the New Testament* (Fifth Ed., 1881), in Appendix D. (pp. 556, 557) gives the original text of the Catalogue of Amphilochius.

[2] Compare Westcott's Article on *Canon* in Smith's *Bible Dict.* already cited (Vol. I., pp. 357—368), a most valuable summary of the whole subject; also the article in Herzog's *Real-Encykl.* (Ed. I, by Oehler; Ed. II, by Strack); see also Schaff-Herzog's *Encycl.*, Vol. I., pp. 385—389, and the well-known works of Bleek, Horne (Fourteenth Ed.) and Keil. Very suggestive, but less conservative, are the works of Driver *(Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament,* 1891), Ryle *(Canon of the Old Testament,* 1892), and Kirkpatrick *(Divine Library of the Old Testament,* 1891).

Greek translation of the wisdom of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), the date of which is somewhat doubtful, but certainly lies between 250—130 B. C. Not only does the prologue expressly refer to the Old Testament according to its three divisions, "the law and the prophets, and the other books of our fathers," "the rest of the books," but also in the book itself it is manifestly assumed as a thing well known. The definite article, "*the* other books of the fathers," and "*the rest of the books*," presupposes a definite class of writings well marked off, and involves the close of the Canon.

The Canon of the Old Testament lay in its present compass before our Lord and his Apostles, just as we have the enumeration of its parts in JOSEPHUS (40—100 A. D.). In his book *Contra Apion*, I, 8, he enumerates twenty-two books "which are justly believed to be inspired." And he adds: "They have suffered no addition, diminution, or change. From our infancy we learn to regard them as decrees of God; we observe them, and if need be, we gladly die for them."

In the New Testament, these Old Testament writings are regarded as one complete whole as in John 5: 39, "*Search the Scriptures*," or in John 10: 35, "*The Scripture cannot be broken.*" Matt 23: 35 and Luke 11: 51 ("*from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zachariah*," i. e., from Genesis to 2 Chronicles) are a witness to the arrangement and compass of our present Hebrew Bible; Luke 24: 44 is evidence of the division into three parts, "the law," "the prophets," and "the psalms;" 2 Tim. 3: 15, 16 looks to the fact that the Scriptures were collected together. In the New Testament, with the exception of some of the Minor Prophets, all the books of the "first" and "second" division are cited. From the third division, Psalms, Proverbs, and Daniel are cited. The

Old Testament Apocryphal Books are never cited in the New Testament, and if there be allusions to them, as there probably are, they are of such a nature as in no degree to imply a recognition of them as inspired books. Thus in Heb. 11: 34, 35 it has been claimed[1] that there is an allusion to the times of the Maccabees; but, if this be granted, it simply, at the most, recognizes the historical truth of a statement, and involves no more than St. Paul's quotations of the Greek poets. From a careful study of all the evidence there can be no reasonable doubt that at the beginning of the Christian era the Jews had a Canon of Sacred Writings distinctly defined, and that this Canon was the same as we now have in our Hebrew Bibles, and accepted by all Protestant Churches as the Canonical Books of the Old Testament.

The authority of Augustine occasioned the reception of the Old Testament Apocrypha into the Canon, by the Council of Hippo, 393, and of Carthage, 397, but there was no churchly sanction of a general kind of this, until the Council of Trent, in its fourth session, gave it its sanction. But the establishment of the Old Testament Canon properly belongs to Israel, not to the Christian Church, which received it from Israel. We find the true view of the matter therefore in Jerome, who limits the Canon to the Hebrew writings, as these alone were accepted and appealed to by our Lord and his Apostles.

The more recent critics have atempted to put the book of Daniel into the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (175—164 B. C.), an era which had lost the consciousness of possessing the spirit of revelation (1 Macc. 4: 46; 9: 27; 14: 41). But that the Book of Daniel forms an integral part of the Canon is clear, 1) from the im-

[1] See STIER'S *Die Apokryphen*, pp. 148, 1853, who professes to find 102 references in the New Testament to the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament.

portance of its relation to the New Testament, in which it is fully accepted as canonical (Matt. 24: 15); 2) from its wonderful internal witness, its prophecies, many of which were demonstrably fulfilled long after the period of Antiochus Epiphanes, and many of which are now fulfilling; 3) from the evidences which many of the best, ripest recent scholars, in conjunction with the older ones, have brought to show that there is no reason for departing from the ancient and received view as to the time of its origin; 4) the latest results of Assyriology and the evidence of the monumental remains, all confirm those statements of Daniel which were denied by critics.

b) *The New Testament Canon.*[1] The collection of the New Testament Canon was relatively late in its origin, and slow in its progress. The history of its formation conveniently divides itself into three periods: 1) The era of the separate circulation and gradual collection of the Apostolic writings, to 170 A. D. (There can be no doubt whatever that at the close of this period the four Gospels occupied the position which they have always retained as the fourfold Apostolic record of the Saviour's ministry. The testimony of Justin Martyr (d. 146?) and of Papias (ab. 150) is decisive. For the New Testament as a whole we have, in the West, the important testimony of the *Muratorian Canon,* and in the East, the *Peshito.* From a careful sifting of all the evidence it seems that at the close of the second cent-

[1] Compare Westcott's Article in Smith's *Bible Dict.* (Amer. Ed., 4 vols.), Vol. I., pp. 368—376; the article in Herzog's *Real-Encykl.* (Ed. I, Landerer; Ed II, by Wold. Schmidt); the latest introductions by Bleek, Reuss, Weiss, Holtzmann, etc. See also Charteris' *Canonicity:* a collection of early testimonies to the Canonical Books of the New Testament, based on Kirchhofer's *Quellensammlung,* Edinburgh, 1881. The standard work on this subject in English is Westcott's *On the Canon of the New Testament.* Fifth Edition. London, 1881.

ury, *2 Peter* is the only book which is not recognized as an Apostolic and authoritative writing). 2) The period marking the separation of the books of the New Testament from the remaining Ecclesiastical literature (170—303 A. D., to the persecution of Diocletian). During this period the books common to the Muratorian or Roman Canon and the Peshito or Syrian Canon were regarded as a whole, authoritative and inspired, and were used as of equal value with the Old Testament. This can be proved by the testimony of contemporary Fathers of the Churches of Asia Minor, Alexandria, and North Africa. Of this testimony Westcott says:[1] "This comprehensive testimony extends to the four Gospels, the Acts, 1 Peter, 1 John, 13 Epistles of St. Paul and the Apocalypse; and with the exception of the Apocalypse, no one of these books was ever afterwards rejected or questioned till modern times." (With reference to the *"antilegomena"* or "disputed" books it may be said, that the *Apocalypse* was universally received by all the writers of the period, with the single exception of Dionysius of Alexandria: that the *Epistle to the Hebrews* was accepted by the Churches of Alexandria, and Syria, but not by those of Africa and Rome; that the Epistles of *James* and *Jude* were little used; and that *2 Peter* was barely known. But our whole testimony is but the evidence of use and not of inquiry). 3) The third period ends with the third council of Carthage (397), in which a catalogue of the books of Scripture was formally ratified by the action of the Council (393—397 A. D.). Of great importance is the testimony of Eusebius (*H. E.* III, 25), who gives us a fair summary of the results which follow from a careful examination of the extant Ante-Nicene literature.[2]

[1] Article on *Canon* in Smith's *Bible Dict.* Vol. I, p. 370, *b*.

[2] See *A Comprehensive General Index* to the Ante-Nicene Fathers. By Bernhard Pick. Buffalo, 1887.

Luther at one time (previous to 1525), expressed doubts in regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews, James, and the Apocalypse. He found doctrinal difficulties in Heb. 6: 4—6; 12: 17; and his objection to the Epistle of James was based upon the seeming contradiction of that Epistle to Paul's doctrine of justification by faith. But the real harmony between Paul and James is now universally conceded. Both teach really that we are justified by faith; but St. James to meet a specific perversion which had ignorantly or wickedly been made of that doctrine, shows that the faith which justifies is the one which also works out righteousness. We are justified by faith, and faith is demonstrated before the eyes of men to be a just and true faith, by works. Luther continued to regard the Apocalypse, because of its prophetic shape and consequent obscurity, of less value than the others books of the Canon.

CHEMNITZ, by his admirable historical investigation, established in the conviction of the Church the thorough canonicity of all these books. GERHARD limits the question to the author of the books, and turns the dogmatic question into an historical one. In QUENSTEDT the whole matter is reduced to little more than an historical notice. HOLLAZ says: "We judge of the canonical authority of Scriptures with reference to its doctrines, by the same proofs and arguments by which we decide in regard to its divine origin... It is proved by external and internal criteria, but especially by the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit illuminating the minds of men, through the Scriptures attentively read or heard from the mouth of a teacher... It is indeed distinctly proved by the testimony of the primitive Church, but not by this alone... We add to the testimony of the primitive Church, the testimony of Script-

ure, its continued preservation for the profitable use of men, and the character of its style."

CHEMNITZ says: "The Scriptures derive canonical authority 1) *mainly* from the Holy Spirit, by whose impulse and inspiration they were written; 2) from the writers themselves, to whom God gave clear and peculiar proofs of their truth, and 3) from the primitive Church, as a witness, in whose day these writings were published and approved.[1]

The disposition of our later theologians has been to decide the canonicity of the books not so much from the transient hesitation of the early Church, nor from the theory of different degrees of inspiration, as from their internal character and contents.

The historical character of Scripture determines its application in the service of Dogmatics. The doctrinal contents of the particular biblical books always stand in connection with the historical matter which pertains to these books. The citation of the Old Testament by older dogmaticians rests upon the supposition that there is an essential unity in the matter of Scripture. In modern Dogmatics the Old Testament proof passages are adduced with far greater caution, and their force is considered as modified by the point of history at which they occur. It is felt that as Revelation grows in the intensity of its brightness, it is necessary to avoid bringing a mode of conception which belongs to the relative twilight, into the purer and fuller light of the New Testament.

4. *The Interpretation of Scripture.*

The biblical interpreter must not only possess certain intellectual and moral qualifications, but his first quali-

[1] The quotations from CHEMNITZ, GERHARD, QUENSTEDT, and HOLLAZ have been condensed from SCHMID.

fication must be a living faith, and in all his attempts to expound Scripture he must be guided by the central truth of all Revelation, salvation in Christ, which is the very essence of Christianity and the material principle of Dogmatics. Moreover in the setting forth of the doctrines of the Bible he must recognize the general development which Revelation passes through in Scripture itself. And though the Church doctrine may be of great service in the interpretation of the Scriptures, still his guide must be Scripture itself as his only norm.

The doctrine of the Sacred Scriptures, of Inspiration, and of the attributes of the Sacred Scriptures, will be presented in the dogmatic system itself. But in speaking of the *interpretation* of Scripture we must also speak of its *perspicuity*.

By the perspicuity of Scripture we mean that Scripture sets forth all things necessary for faith, holiness, and salvation in such clear terms, that an earnest, unprejudiced mind may easily understand them. Its mysteries are in the nature of the *things*, not in the obscurity of its *phrases*. It is its own interpreter in all things needful.

The clearness of Scripture is two-fold.

LUTHER says: "One kind of clearness is *external*, lying in the ministry of the Word, the *other* in the knowledge of the heart. If you speak of the *internal* clearness, no man understands a single iota in the Scriptures by the natural powers of his own mind, unless he have the Spirit of God; all have obscure hearts. The Holy Spirit is required for the understanding of the whole Scripture and of all its parts. If you allude to the *external* clearness, there is nothing left obscure and ambiguous, but all things brought to light by the Word are perfectly clear." Again: "The things of God

are obscure; the things of Scripture are perspicuous. The doctrines in themselves are obscure; but in so far as they are presented in Scripture they are manifest, if we are willing to be content with that knowledge which God communicates in the Scriptures to the Church."

The Lutheran Church has always laid the greatest stress upon the *Analogy of faith* as an inspired means of interpretation.

QUENSTEDT: "Obscure passages, which need explanation, can and should be explained by other passages that are more clear, and thus the Scripture itself furnishes an interpretation of obscure expressions.... From no other source than the Sacred Scriptures themselves can a certain and infallible interpretation of Scripture be drawn. For Scripture itself, or rather the Holy Spirit speaking in Scripture or through it, is the legitimate and independent interpreter of itself."[1]

GERHARD: "All interpretation of Scripture should be according to the *analogy of faith*...This signifies that the interpretation of Scripture should be instituted and carried on in such a manner as to accord with the usual line of thought which is conveyed in Scripture concerning each leading doctrine. For, since all Scripture was given by the immediate suggestion of the Holy Spirit, and is inspired, all things in it are harmonious and perfectly consistent with each other, so that no discrepancy or self-contradiction occurs in it...Nothing is ever to be broached in the interpretation of Scripture that conflicts with the rule of faith; and hence, if we be not exactly able at all times to ascertain the exact sense of any passage, as designed by the Holy Spirit, we should nevertheless beware of proposing anything that is contrary to the analogy of faith."

[1] The quotations from our Dogmaticians are condensed from SCHMID.

The Lutheran Church has also always opposed the theory of a *multiple* sense in Scripture. There is no foundation whatever for the position, held by some, that each passage, or certain passages, can be understood in different ways, equally conformed to the divine thought. No wonder, with such views, that the Bible becomes a changeable, doubtful rule of faith, flexible at the will of the fancies or passions of men, or fluctuating with the tendencies of the times. If we would grant such a *multiple* or *double* sense in Scripture, then, indeed, the problem of interpretation would become indeterminate, the Bible would become a field for the display of the wit and vanity of the theologian, instead of being the simple, clear, and edifying guide of salvation which it professes to be.

GERHARD: "There is but one proper and true sense of each passage, which the Holy Spirit thereby intends, and which is drawn from the proper signification of the words, and only from this *literal sense* available arguments may be derived... All interpretation of Scripture should be literal, and there should be no departure from the letter in matters of faith, unless the Scriptures themselves indicate the figurativeness and explain it." Again: "Allegories, tropes, analogies, are not different senses, but different adaptations of the same sense and subject designated by the letter."

This does not prevent the applications of the literal sense of a passage in a *spiritual* way. The *literal* sense of Scripture may be used as an *allegory*, a *type*, or a *parable*.

CALOVIUS: "It is called the *allegorical* sense, when a Scriptural historical narrative of things, that really occurred, is applied to a certain mystery or spiritual doctrine, by the intention of the Holy Spirit, in an alle-

gorical manner; it is called *typical,* when under external facts or prophetic visions, things hidden, either present or future, are prefigured, or especially matters relating to the New Testament are shadowed forth; and *parabolical,* when something is described as having really occurred, and yet applied to designate something spiritual."

GERHARD[1] states the principles that underlie all true interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures as follows:

1) Our mind is blind without the light of the Holy Spirit;

2) In addition to this natural blindness, some are blinded by singular wickedness and an unyielding hardness of heart; but neither of these kinds of blindness, makes or proves the Scriptures obscure;

3) Because our mind is blind we must pray for the light of the Holy Spirit;

4) Our mind is not now immediately illuminated by the Holy Spirit, but by means of the Word heard and meditated upon;

5) The doctrines necessary to be known by every one for salvation are taught in Scripture in clear and perspicuous language;

6) The remaining passages of Scripture receive light from these important doctrines;

7) From the clear passages of Scripture a rule of faith is deduced to which the exposition of the more difficult passages must be conformed;

8) If we cannot definitely and exactly ascertain the precise meaning of all difficult passages, it is sufficient that we do not propose any interpretation contrary to the analogy of faith;

9) But the more obscure passages may be rightly

[1] The quotations from our older Dogmaticians are condensed from Schmid's *Doctrinal Theology.*

and accurately interpreted, if we apply the means calculated to remove the difficulties;

10) To find out thse means, we must seek the causes of the obscurity;

11) Some passages are obscure in themselves, others, when compared with other passages; if they merely seem to be in conflict with other passages, this obscurity may be removed by reconciling the passages;

12) Those passages that are obscure in themselves, are so, either as to their subject-matter or as to their words. The obscurity in regard to the subject-matter is removed by the analogy of faith, and by those settled axioms in individual articles of belief, which are to be regarded as the unfailing guide;

13) The obscurity in regard to the words is removed

a) by the grammatical analysis of sentences,

b) by the rhetorical exposition of tropes and figures,

c) by the logical consideration of the order and the circumstances,

d) by an acquaintance with physical science,

e) but the greatest assistance is afforded by a prudent and diligent collation of Scripture passages.

§ 13. The Church Doctrine and the Subjective Consciousness of Faith.

A system of Dogmatics must have a churchly as well as a biblical character. Its harmony with the doctrine of the Church should not, however, be a mere external one, but one produced through the fellowship of the faith which the dogmatician himself has with the doctrine of the

Church, and which he seeks to express in his dogmatic system.

1. *The Churchly Character of Dogmatics.*

The faith and doctrinal thinking of the present is conditioned by the intellectual labors and the development of Church doctrine in the past, and must consequently assure itself of its essential harmony with the past; for there are no absolute breaks in human knowledge. Truth may be obscured but not annihilated, and the sciences which seem least historical are nevertheless historical.

The man who takes up the Bible now without reference to what has been done toward its elucidation in the past, and without being guided by the development of doctrine, is exactly as foolish as the man who would undertake to take up any branch of science without regard to what has been done before.

Great connecting links in the continuing development of the Church doctrine are furnished by the Confessions, which, as they were occasioned by the historical necessity of their times, and conditioned by those connections as to the mode in which they present doctrine, are to be interpreted and vindicated by their history.

MARTENSEN:[1] "A dogmatic treatise claiming to be biblical, but not churchly, would from that very fact not be biblical, since the Bible itself points to a *confessing* Church, which is to perpetuate itself through all ages."

2. *The Confessions of the Church.*

KRAUTH: "Faith makes men Christians, but confession alone marks them as Christians. The Rule of Faith (the Bible) is God's voice to us; Faith is the hearing of

[1] *Christian Dogmatics*, §28.

that voice, and the Confession is our reply of assent to it. By our faith we are known to the Lord as his, by our Confession we are known to each other as his children. As the creed is not, and cannot be the Rule of Faith, but is its confession merely, so the Bible, because it is the Rule of Faith, is of necessity not its Confession... The man who has true faith desires to have it known, and is bound to confess his faith... Fidelity to the Rule of Faith, fidelity to the faith the Bible teaches, demands that there shall be a Confession of the faith.[1]

1) *The necessity of Confessions.* Confessions are necessary for two reasons: to establish the unity of the faith, and to ward off error. This necessity is both psychological and historical. It is not an absolute necessity, but what may be called one "of expediency." For by her confessions a Church gives evidence of the faith she teaches and shows in what she differs from other Churches, and also bears continual testimony against those who would introduce error.

On the *necessity* of Confessions the *The Formula of Concord*[2] expresses itself very clearly: "Because directly after the times of the Apostles, and even in their lives, false teachers and heretics arose, and against them, in the Early Church, *symbols,* i. e. brief, plain confessions, were composed, which were regarded as the unanimous, universal Christian faith, and confession of the orthodox and true Church, namely *the Apostles' Creed,* the *Nicene Creed,* and the *Athanasian Creed;* we confess them as binding upon us, and hereby reject all heresies and dogmas which, contrary to them, have been introduced into the Church of God."

[1] See *Conservative Reformation,* pp. 166, 167.

[2] *Epitome,* Introd. II.

2) *The authority of the Confessions.*[1] The authority of the Confessions is internal and external. Their internal authority consists in their conformity with Scripture. "Just as men are in duty bound to believe the Scriptures, when their divine origin is known, so are they bound to believe and accept the Confessions when their conformity with the Holy Scripture is seen. Their external authority consists in their approval by the Church. With respect to the inner authority, a distinction is to be drawn between the doctrines set forth as the faith of the Church, the refutations of errors and prescribed formuals of expression, on the one hand, and on the other the arguments and illustrations employed for their support. An error in the latter does not invalidate the former. When the doctrinal statements supported are found to be scriptural, then the Confessions can be consistently subscribed, even though defects in the argument, or inaptness in the illustrations, or mistakes in citation of authorities, may be noticed."

With reference to the Confessions of our own Evangelical Lutheran Church the *Formula of Concord*[2] says: "As to the schism in matters of faith which has occurred in our time, we regard the unanimous consensus and declaration of our Christian faith and confession, especially against the Papacy and its false worship, idolatry, superstition, and against other sects, as the *Symbol* of our time, viz., *The First Unaltered Augsburg Confession* delivered to the Emperor Charles V. at Augsburg in the year 1530, in the great Diet, together with the *Apology,* and the *Articles,* composed at *Smalcald* in the year 1537, and subscribed by the chief theologians of that time. And because such matters pertain also to the laity and the salvation of their souls, we con-

[1] See Jacobs' Hist. Introd. to *Book of Concord,* Vol. 2, p. 12.
[2] *Epitome,* Introd. III. 4—8, p. 492 (JACOBS).

fessionally acknowledge the *Small* and *Large Catechisms* of Dr. Luther, as they are included in Luther's works, as the Bible of the laity, wherein everything is comprised which is treated at greater length in Holy Scripture, and is necessary that a Christian man know for his salvation."

"In accordance with this direction, as above announced, all doctrines should be adjusted, and that which is contrary thereto should be rejected and condemned, as opposed to the unanimous declaration of our faith."

"In this way the distinction between the Holy Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testament and all other writings is preserved, and the Holy Scriptures alone remain the only judge, rule, and standard, according to which, as the only test-stone, all dogmas should and must be discerned and judged, as to whether they be good or evil, right or wrong."

"But the other Symbols and writings cited are not judges, as the Holy Scriptures, but only a witness and declaration of the faith, as to how at any time the Holy Scriptures have been understood and explained in the articles in controversy in the Church of God, by those who then lived, and by what arguments the dogmas conflicting with the Holy Scriptures were rejected and condemned."

Our Confessions, however, are regarded as decisive statements for that which is valid in the Church. Thus the *Solid Declaration,* the second part of the *Formula of Concord,* says *(Book of Concord,* Vol. 1, p. 537, $_{10}$) : "By what has thus far been said concerning the summary of our Christian doctrine we have only meant that we have a unanimously received, definite, common form of doctrine, which our Evangelical churches to-

gether and in common confess; from and according to which, because it has been derived from God's Word, all other writings should be judged and adjusted as to how far they are to be approved and accepted."

From the statement of the *Formula of Concord* that creeds "are not judges, as are the Holy Scriptures, but only a witness and declaration of the faith" (p. 492, $_8$), the inference has been drawn that we can set them aside at pleasure, and still be consistent Lutherans. On this point Dr. Krauth says[1]: "The setting aside of a creed either involves setting aside its doctrines; or it does not. If the doctrines of a creed are ever true, they are always true, and hence we cannot set aside the doctrines of a true creed without setting aside the truth itself. If it be said, we are going to set aside the creed, while we retain its doctrines, we can only justify ourselves in this by showing that we can make a gain for the truth by a new statement of it. A new creed must either embrace the same as the old, or something conflicting with the old, or something less than the old, or something more than the old. A creed to embrace the same, is confessedly no gain as to the matter. A new creed can only conflict with a true old one, by conflicting with the truth itself. A creed which has less than a true one, has less truth than the old, and if we need the creed to say more than the old, all experience has shown that it is best to let the old stand and supplement it with the new. Our Church has never prepared a new creed to take the place of an old one. If the definition of our creeds, given in the *Formula of Concord,* stands, then the creeds themselves must stand, until other creeds more happily stating the same doctrines, shall be produced. But without exception,

[1] See his *Manuscript Lectures.*

the men who wish new creeds to take the place of old ones, really wish to have new doctrines to take the place of the old."

3) *Meaning of Subscription to the Confessions.* Subscriptions to the Confessions are classified as *quia* and *quatenus*, i. e., "because they agree with Scripture," and "so far as they agree with the Scripture." The latter mode is an evasion, because men holding the most diverse views of doctrine might then subscribe our Confessions.[1] Fidelity to the Confessions is not inconsistent with the right of private judgment. All we ask is, that if a man's private judgment of the Word of God does not make him believe the Lutheran doctrine as witnessed by our Church in her Confessions, he should not pretend to be a Lutheran, he should not apply for ordination in order to minister at her altars, and if, as a minister of the Church he have abandoned the faith of the Church, he has no right to use her name as his shelter in undermining the faith of those to whom he ministers. It is not enough if such a one maintains that the view he holds is clear to his private judgment. He has no right to enter or remain in any Christian Church, except as its terms of membership give him that right.

KRAUTH[2]: "When we confess, that, in the exercise of our right of private judgment, our Bible has made us Lutherans, we neither pretend to claim that other men shall be made Lutherans by force, nor that their private judgment shall, or will, of necesssity, reach the results of ours. We only contend, that, if their private judgment of the Bible does not make them Lutherans, they shall not pretend that it does. We do not say, that

[1] See Jacobs' *Book of Concord*, Vol. 2, p. 13.

[2] *Conservative Reformation*, pp. 171—175.

any man shall believe that the Confession of our Church is Scriptural. We only contend, that he should neither say, nor seem to say so, if he does not believe it... Those who imagine that the right of private judgment is the right of men, within the Lutheran Church, and bearing her hallowed name, to teach what they please in the face of her testimony, know not the nature of the right they claim, nor of the Church, whose very life involves her refusal to have fellowship with them in their error. It is not the right of private judgment which makes or marks a man Lutheran... It is the judgment he reaches in exercising that right which determines what he is."

In these days of laxity of doctrine and protest against Confessionalism it is well to consider the pointed statements of Dr. Plitt[1]: "Is is as impossible for the Church to be without a Confession as without preaching and divine service; and sooner or later the summons must come to the entire Church or an individual part of it to give to its Confessions not only a clear, but also an established and definite expression... It is the facts of her experience of salvation which the Church, so far as she has become acquainted with them, brings into expression... The knowledge of these manifold facts is only very gradually attained... The particular agents of this work of attaining knowledge are persons standing in the faith of the Church and constrained by God's Spirit, as God generally effects all progress in Church history, through persons filled with the Spirit... Moreover, since the Church is no longer at the beginning of her development and of her activity in the framing of dogmas, these agents will enter into

[1] In his *Einleitung in die Augustana*, Vol. I, pp. 3—16. 2 vols. Erlangen, 1867—68. We condense from the translation given by Dr. Jacobs in *Book of Concord*, Vol. 2, pp. 313—321.

close connection with the past of the Church, and, appropriating what the Church has received from the labor of fathers as a permanent possession of knowledge, will make still further inquiry...

All progress in knowledge, if it be healthy, connects itself with what has been learned before, and amplifies or corrects it... It is clear that the times, when the life of the Church flows on in a calm, even current, are not adapted to a further definition and settlement of the Church's doctrine. This occurs when a fact of salvation is called into question by adversaries, or even by members of the Church, or is apprehended in such a manner that Christian experience of salvation thereby suffers injury. Then the Church arises to defend her treasure and repel the error, which is not so offensive to the understanding as it is dangerous to souls. It becomes then the office of persons full of the Spirit to enter into the conflict, and with prayer and investigation to begin the work... The course of the controversy which will claim the entire sympathy of the Church moves only by means of antanogisms, for almost all Christian facts of salvation have a double side, a divine and a human, which are not to be made prominent only on the one side, but their harmonious connection with each other requires to be properly adjusted also on the part of the understanding. Before this happens the Church does not really attain tranquility...

Although the Church is constantly changing in her members, she builds herself up by constantly sinking deeper into these divine truths; by instruction she implants them into the hearts of the children growing up within her, and makes confession of them also before those who do not yet belong to her, that they may become life-truths also to them... This testimony is an

expression of the life of the Church, without which she could not be conceived of. Just on this account she does not commit to chance or to the inclination of an individual the issuing of such a testimony, but she herself undertakes this task and fulfils, through a permanent office, through officially-appointed witnesses; whereby, however, it is not meant that other members also of the Church, whom the Spirit of Christ impels, could not be qualified and would not be justified in acting as witnesses. It is manifest, then, that the official witnesses, who, in what comprises the fulfilment of the calling pertaining to the entire Church, dare not exercise a work of their own inclination, but they who stand there in the service of the Church, have to act only in the sense of the Church. As to what, therefore, concerns the doctrine, they are throughout pointed to that which is firmly established as the faith of the congregation and the doctrine of the Church, and which is delivered to them in this capacity through the Confessions of the Church. The Confessions are to them the norm of their official activity... By this obligation required of the teachers no violence is done them. For the Church has not compelled them to accept the doctrines, but they have offered themselves to her for a service which the Church will not prevent them from abandoning at any moment. If, however, she has accepted their offer, she has done so upon the presumption that they who desire her ministerial office are also one with her in the faith... He who in the true sense is churchly, and at the same time of a sincere heart, will not complain of the constraint of the symbols.[1] But to him who in the heart does not stand in the center

[1] "No one who is true to the Augsburg Confession will complain of these writings, but will cheerfully accept and tolerate them as witnesses of the truth" (*F. C.*, p. 538, 12).

of the faith of the Church, or who in the progress of knowledge has fallen into error, the symbol becomes of course a law; it is to him strange and more or less incomprehensible. He experiences now constraint, as he ought. No one can expect the Church to leave it to the option of the individual as to how he should exercise his office of testimony and confession... As she cannot know either whether all who apply for service in her ministry do this from a sincere heart, or whether all her teachers will in the future be preserved from error, she must at least maintain her rights and protect the welfare of the whole, so far as it is possible, against the subjective arbitrariness of the individual. The obligation to the symbols becomes necessary, and just those teachers of the Church who are the loudest in their complaints of it as an intolerable constraint, prove thereby how necessary it is...

The teacher who enters into the service of the Church is actually free with respect to the symbols when he truly shares the faith of the Church, and is thus in a full sense a living member of it. This true freedom he may, in case of necessity, exercise even with respect to the symbols...The teacher who is convinced that he has discovered a more suitable form has not only the right, but it is his duty, to bring this to the knowledge of the Church; and no intelligent person will see in his activity, directed to the improvement of the Church's doctrine, any opposition to the same... That the one making an innovation will act with great prudence and forbearance is self-evident, provided he is at heart in a right relation to the Church. Above all, he will regard it a matter of great moment to investigate aright the symbol itself before he comes forward with his opposition. He will not only with all conscientiousness read,

but will also study it, in order, so far as it is possible, to grasp its true sense; he will examine it according to the not generally easily observed distinction between what, on the one hand, belongs to the matter concerned and its simple designation, and, on the other, what may be a purely temporal addition. Such an investigation of the earnest labor of the Fathers as would be not merely scientific would itself admonish still more humility and modesty.

Thus it is also clear that the current talk about the insufficiency of the symbols cannot in the least be supported. This, too, often proceeds from those who themselves do not share in the faith of the Church, and, just on that account, are incapable of comprehending the true sense of her Confession; and with their voice there accords that of a large number of such as have scarcely superficially read the Confessions, not to say studied them... It is manifest, therefore, of how great importance it must be to the minister of the Church to obtain the best possible understanding of her Confessions. But it will certainly become clear likewise that this knowledge is attained not so much by the study of the later dogmatics, as by the investigation and study, on all sides, of the period in which these documents originated. As they are the result of an historical development, the attempt ought to be made to comprehend this in all its tendencies."

4) *We must remain faithful to our Confessions.* The object of a Creed is not to find out what God teaches, for this we find in the Bible, but to show what we believe. The Bible is the rule of faith, and the Creed the confession of our faith. A Lutheran is a Christian whose rule of faith is the Bible, and whose creed is the Book of Concord.

KRAUTH:[1] "As genuine Lutheranism is most Biblical among systems which professedly ground themselves on the supreme authority of God's word; as it is most evangelical among the systems that magnify our Saviour's grace, so is our Church at once most truly Catholic among all Churches which acknowledge that the faith of God's people is one, and most truly Protestant among all bodies claiming to be Protestant. She is the mother of all true Protestantism. Her Confession at Augsburg is the first official statement of Scriptural doctrine and usage ever issued against Romish heresy and corruption. Her Confessions are a wall of adamant against Romanism... The doctrines of our Church have proved themselves the most mighty of all doctrines in winning men from Rome, and strongest of all doctrines in fixing the hearts of men, as a bulwark against all her efforts to regain the ground she had lost... Suppose it were true, that the arguments for the pure doctrine of the Confessions seem to have little weight with men, shall we cease to urge them? After nineteen centuries of struggle, Christianity is in minority in the world... After centuries of argument for the Trinity, there are, perhaps, more Socinians than ever. After three centuries, in which the pure doctrine of justification has been urged, millions in the Romish Church and very many nominal Protestants reject it. With all the arguments for infant baptism, with the proofs urged so long and so ably for the validity of other modes of Baptism than immersion, how many millions of Baptists there are... How little headway a pure and consistent faith in the gospel makes, after so many centuries! But what have we to do with all this? Our business is to hold and urge the truth in all its purity, whether men will hear,

[1] *Conservative Reformation*, pp. 187—200.

or whether they will forbear. Truth will, at length, reach its aim and do its work...

In the great mercy of God a reaction and revival in the true sense is taking place...The work is going on, and will go on, until the old ways have been found—till the old banner again floats on every breeze, and the old faith, believed, felt, and lived, shall restore the Church to her primal glory and holy strength."

5) *Intelligent fidelity to our Confessions must be an essential object of theologicol training.* At no time in the history of the Christian Church has it been necessary to lay greater stress on efficiency of ministerial training than the present. In this age of the worship of reason the minister must be thoroughly prepared with all knowledge which adapts him to the Scriptures, and the development of the Church in faith and creed as she rests on her foundation, the Word of God, or rather, as she rests on him of whom all Scripture is witness.

KRAUTH:[1] "The student of theology must be taught the history of the Church in order to test all things, and hold fast to the good, and in order to comprehend the force and value of the decisions, on disputed points, which the Church maintains over against all errorists. ...He must master the great facts in the history of the Church of all time; but most of all, the history of our own Lutheran Church, the richest, the most suggestive, the most heart-inspiring of the whole...

It is in the simple Biblical faith, in the incorrupt, profound, and self-harmonizing system of doctrine, in the historical caution and thoroughness, in the heart-felt piety, in the reverential spirit of worship, in the holy activity, which reaches every want of the souls and

[1] *Conservative Reformation*, pp. 176—78.

bodies of men, in fidelity in the pulpit and pastoral life, in uncomprising maintenance of sound government, in all these, which belong to our Church, it is in these the men of the future should be shaped. We would have them grounded in a thorough knowledge, an ardent love, a practical exhibition of all that belongs to the true idea of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, of the Evangelical Lutheran Christian, and of the Evangelical Lutheran Pastor. But to be worthy of the Church of Christian purity and of Christian freedom to which they belong, the Church of Luther and Melanchthon, of Arndt and Gerhard, of Spener and Francke, of Schwartz and Oberlin, of Muhlenberg and Harms, and of departed worthies, whose voices yet linger in our ears, they need a faith whose *Confession* shall be as articulate, as its convictions are deep."

3. *A Brief History of the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.*

The Book of Concord,[1] published June 25, 1580, contains all the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church, and includes the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Creed, and the six distinctive Confessions of the Lutheran Church, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Smalcald Articles, the Small Catechism, the Large Catechism, and the Formula of Concord.

1) The *Apostles'* Creed is so called not because it was composed by the Apostles, but because it is a brief summary of the doctrine taught by the Apostles. It gradually grew out of the confessions recorded in the Scriptures—(Mark 12: 29; John 17: 3, *"Thee, the only true God;"* 1 Cor. 8: 4, *"There is no God but one;"* Gal.

[1] The most valuable edition of the original texts is that of Müller, 7th ed., Gütersloh, 1890.

3: 20, *"God is one;"* 1 Tim. 2: 5, *"For there is one God;"* John 1: 49, *"Thou art the Son of God"* (Nathanael); John 6: 68, 69, *"Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God"* (Peter); Matt. 16: 16, *"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God"* (Peter); John 20: 28, *"My Lord and my God"* (Thomas). St. Paul gives us his confession in 1 Cor. 8: 6; 1 Tim. 3: 16; Heb. 6: 1, 2; 5: 12; 1 Cor. 15: 3, 4; 2 Tim. 1: 13, 14; St. John in 1 John 4: 2; 2 John 10) — and out of the baptismal formula (Matt. 28: 19, 20), which last determined its Trinitarian order and arrangement. In the churches of the West a distinction soon arose between the *baptismal* confessions and the *Rules of Faith.* The latter became more explicit and were more particularly directed against false doctrine. The former, the *baptismal* confessions, finally took the form of the *Apostles' Creed,* while the latter, the *Rules of Faith,* became substantially the same as the *Nicene Creed.* The creed confessed at baptism, at first, was not precisely the same. In different congregations different forms were used, some shorter, some longer. The most complete forms of the baptismal creed in use in the West were found in the Churches of Rome, Aquileia, and Milan in Southern Europe, and in the African Churches of Carthage and Hippo. The form used in the Church at Rome gradually gained acceptance in the West on account of its intrinsic excellence and the commanding position of the Church. The Latin text of the Creed of the Church at Rome is first given by Rufinus (about 390 A. D., d. 410), and the Greek text, which is probably older than the Latin, we have from Marcellus of Ancyra, who lived about 340 A. D. The Roman Creed was gradually enlarged by the addition of several ar-

ticles, and it was not until the close of the fifth century that the present text of the Apostles' Creed came into use, and not until the eighth that it was generally accepted in the Churches of the West.[1]

2) As the Apostles' Creed had its origin in the baptismal confession used in the Western Churches, so likewise the *Nicene* Creed had its origin in the baptismal formula used in the Eastern Churches. As the Eastern Church was continually in conflict with heresy, the baptismal confessions used in their Churches, even before the Council of Nicæa (325 A. D.), were more metaphysical, more definite and explicit than the Apostles' Creed, especially in the statement of the divinity of Christ. This can be seen from the Creed of Eusebius, on which the Nicene Creed was based. The *Nicene* Creed can be distinguished in three forms: 1) The original Nicene Creed was adopted at the first General Council, held at Nicæa in Bithynia, not far from Constantinople, in 325 A. D. This council was attended by 318 bishops and was called to settle the Arian controversy. The Creed, however, abruptly ended with the words "and in the Holy Ghost." 2) At the second General Council, held at Constantinople in 381 A. D., consisting, however, of only 150 bishops, a few additions were made to the first two articles, but to the last article, treating of the Holy Ghost, important additions were made, especially directed against those who denied the Deity of the Holy Ghost. This enlarged Creed is known as the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan Creed of 381, but there is no evidence that it was accepted by a council, before the fourth General Council, held at Chalcedon,

[1] For a fuller presentation see SCHAFF'S *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. 1, pp. 14—23; especially CASPARI'S *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel.* 3 vols., Christiania, 1866—1875.

451 A. D. 3) The final change made in the *Nicene* Creed took place in the Western Church, by the addition of the little word *"filioque"* (and from the Son), the occasion of the greatest schism in Christendom, for that one word, together with the question of the Jurisdiction of the Pope of Rome, divides the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches of the present day. This expression *"filioque"* was put into the Creed by the Latin Church without consulting the Church of the East. The first trace of this word in the Nicene Creed we find in the proceedings of the third Council of Toledo in Spain, 589 A. D., but by the close of the ninth century it was generally accepted in the West, and at the Reformation passed over into the Protestant Churches.

3) The origin of the *Athanasian Creed* like that of the *Apostles'* is involved in obscurity. It is called *Athanasian,* not because Athanasius wrote it, but because it is a noble exposition and defence of the doctrine of the Trinity, of which Athanasius (d. 373) was the great champion. Of its authorship nothing is known for certain. It arose in the Latin churches of Gaul, North Africa, and Spain, drawn up originally, no doubt, by a follower of Augustine. It borrows some passages from Augustine and other Latin Fathers, and first appears in its full form about the beginning of the ninth century. The Creed consists of two chief parts, preceded by a prologue of two verses, and followed by an epilogue of one verse. The first part, verses 3—26, sets forth the orthodox doctrine of the Holy Trinity to the exclusion of every kind of subordination of essence. The second part, verses 27—39, contains a very clear statement of the orthodox doctrine concerning the Person of Christ, as settled by the Council of Chalcedon, 451 A. D., and in this respect it is a valuable supplement to the

Apostles' and *Nicene Creeds.* The Athanasian Creed acquired great authority in the Western Church, and during the Middle Ages it was almost daily used in the morning devotions. In the Greek Church, however, it never obtained formal ecclesiastical sanction, and is to this day only used for private devotion,—the clause of the double procession of the Spirit, however, being omitted. The *Reformers* accepted the Athanasian Creed, and Luther says of it: "It has been so composed that I do not know whether, since the days of the Apostles, anything more important and glorious has been written."

4) As the *Augsburg Confession* is based upon articles which had already been prepared it may be useful to give the main facts in chronological order.

1) On October 1—3, 1529, a Conference took place at Marburg between Luther and the Saxon divines upon the one side, and Zwingli and the Swiss divines on the other side. Luther in conjunction with Melanchthon, Jonas, Osiander, Brenz and Agricola, prepared the XV Marburg Articles. These Articles were meant to show on what points the Lutherans and Zwinglians agreed and also to state the point on which they did not agree, — and as a fair statement of the points disputed and undisputed, were signed by all the theologians of both parties.[1]

2) On the basis of these XV Articles of Marburg, Luther with the advice and assistance of the other theologians prepared XVII Articles, which were presented at the Conference held at Schwabach, October 16, 1529, and hence known as the XVII Articles of Schwabach.[2]

[1] A translation of these Articles is given in JACOBS' edition of *Book of Concord*, Vol. 2, pp. 69—74.

[2] For translation see JACOBS' edition of *Book of Concord*, Vol. 2, pp. 69—74.

3) These XVII Articles of Schwabach are mainly doctrinal, and in a revised form are *the basis* of the XXI Doctrinal Articles of the Augsburg Confession. But as they had been presented at Smalcald, November 29, 1529, they have sometimes been called the Smalcald Articles, and were also known for a long time as the Torgau Articles, because in a revised form Luther had sent them to Torgau, March 20—27, 1530.

4) Charles V. finally summoned a Diet of the German Empire to convene at Augsburg, April 8, 1530; and he directed the friends of the Evangelical faith to prepare, for presentation to the Diet, a statement of the doctrinal points of division. This summons reached the Elector John of Saxony at Torgau on March 11, 1530. On March 14, a letter was sent to Luther, Jonas, Bugenhagen and Melanchthon at Wittenberg, summoning them immediately to lay aside all other work and devote all the time that was left to the preparation of a paper covering all the articles, both of faith and of external usages and ceremonies, that were involved in the conflict. The theologians were instructed to deliver the result of the deliberations in person to the Elector at Torgau on the following Sunday, March 20. This special writing, of which Luther was the chief author, assisted by the other theologians at Wittenberg, was sent to the Elector at Torgau, March 20—27, 1530, and are the *Torgau Articles* proper. These articles are on *abuses,* and *form the basis* of Articles XXII—XXVIII, of the Augsburg Confession, its articles on *Abuses.* In addition to these articles, Luther, however, also sent a revised copy of the XVII Articles of Schwabach, as stated above.[1]

[1] For translation of the *Torgau Articles* see JACOBS' edition of *Book of Concord,* Vol. 2, pp. 75—98.

5) These two sets of Articles sent to Torgau, March 20—27, 1530, *form the basis* of the Augsburg Confession, and are mainly from the hand of Luther, — the XVII Articles of Schwabach forming the basis of the XXI Doctrinal Articles, and the *Torgau Articles proper* forming the basis of the VII Articles on Abuses. But as the Diet of Augsburg was not opened until June 20, time was given for Melanchthon to elaborate the Confession and give to it its matchless form. Melanchthon himself in his *Corpus Doctrinæ* (German, 1559, Latin, 1560), gives a brief history of the composition of the Augsburg Confession, how "in the presence of the Elector and princes and legates who subscribed it, with the counselors and preachers, all the articles were discussed and determined upon in regular course, sentence by sentense," how "the complete form of the Confession was subsequently sent to Luther, who wrote to the princes that he had both read this Confession and approved it."[1]

6) Dr. Krauth in his *Conservative Reformation*, pp. 219, 220: "In six instances, the very numbers of the Schwabach Articles correspond with those of the Augsburg Confession. They coincide throughout, not only in doctrine, but in a vast number of cases word for word, the Augsburg Confession being a mere transcript, in these cases, of the Schwabach Articles. The differences are either merely stylistic, or are made more necessary by the larger object and compass of the Augsburg Confession; but so thoroughly do the Schwabach Articles condition and shape every part of it, as to give it even the peculiarity of phraseology characteristic of Luther."

"To a large extent, therefore, Melanchthon's work

[1] See especially the historic presentation by Dr. Krauth in his *Conservative Reformation*, pp. 216—248.

is but an elaboration of Luther's, and to a large extent it is not an elaboration, but a reproduction. To Luther belong the doctrinal power of the Confession, its inmost life and spirit, and to Melanchthon its matchless form. Both are in some sense its authors, but the most essential elements are due to Luther, who is by pre-eminence its author, as Melanchthon is its composer."

7) The Confession, in Latin and German, was presented to the Diet of Augsburg on Saturday, June 25, 1530. "Both texts are originals; neither text is properly a translation of the other; both present precisely the same doctrine, with verbal differences, which make the one an indispensable guide in the understanding of the other; both texts have, consequently, the same authority. The German copy was the one selected, on national grounds, to be read aloud. Both copies were taken by the Emperor, who handed the German to the Elector of Mentz, and retained the Latin. It is not now known where either of the originals is, nor with certainty that either is in existence. In addition to seven unauthorized editions in the year 1530, the Confession was printed, under Melanchthon's own direction, both in Latin and German while the Diet was still sitting." (Dr Krauth).[1]

8) Melanchthon's varied edition of the *Latin* Confession is of three kinds: 1) The edition of 1531, 8vo. The variations are slight and of a verbal nature. It has never been pretended that they affect the meaning. This edition has often been confounded with the original quarto edition of 1530. 2) The quarto edition of 1540, known as the *Variata,* because in it Melanchthon has elaborated anew some of the articles, and has made many important changes. 3) The octavo edition of

[1] *Conservative Reformation,* pp. 242, 243.

1542, the *Variata* varied. This last has been frequently reprinted, and is sometimes confounded with the *Variata* of 1540.

Of the edition of 1540, known as the *Variata,* Dr. Krauth says:[1] "It is not to be disputed that in various respects, as a statement of doctrine, the Variata has great beauty and great value, and that where it indisputably is in perfect harmony with the Confession, it furnishes an important aid in its interpretation. Had Melanchthon put forth the new matter purely as a private writing, most of it would have received the unquestioned admiration to which it was well entitled. But he made the fatal mistake of treating a great official document as if it were his private property, yet preserving the old title, the old form in general, and the old signatures.[2]

9) Of the structure and contents of the Augsburg Confession Dr. Krauth says:[3] "It contains, as its two fundamental parts, a positive assertion of the most necessary truths, and a negation of the most serious abuses. It comprises: I. *The Preface;* II. *Twenty-one Articles of Faith;* III. *An Epilogue-Prologue* which unites the first part with the second, and makes a graceful transition from the one to the other; IV. *The Second Great Division,* embracing *Seven Articles on Abuses;* V. *The Epilogue,* followed by the Subscriptions."

"The Articles may be classified thus: 1) The *Confessedly Catholic,* or Universal Christian Articles, — those which Christendom, Greek and Roman, have confessed,

[1] *Conservative Reformation,* pp. 245, 246.

[2] For a translation of the *Variata* of 1540 see JACOBS' edition of *Book of Concord,* Vol. 2, pp. 103—147; for the chief divergences of the Variata of 1542 from that of 1540, see pp. 147—158.

[3] Pp. 253—255.

especially in the Apostles' and Nicene Creed...2) *The Protestant Articles,* — those opposed to the errors of doctrine, and the abuses in usage, of the Papal part of the Church of the West... 3) *The Evangelical Articles,* or parts of Articles, — those articles which especially assert the doctrines which are connected most directly with the Gospel in its essential character as tidings of redemption to lost man, — the great doctrines of grace. These articles are especially those which teach the fall of man, the radical corruption of his nature, his exposure to eternal death, and the absolute necessity of regeneration (Art. II) ; the atonement of Christ, and the saving work of the Holy Spirit (III) ; justification by faith alone (IV), the true character of repentance, or conversion (XII) ; and the impotence of man's own will to effect it (XVIII). 4) *The Conservative Articles,* the Articles which set forth *distinctive biblical* doctrines which the *Lutheran Church* holds in peculiar purity, over against the corruptions of Romanism, the extravagance of Radicalism, the perversions of Rationalism, or the imperfect development of theology. Such are the doctrines of the proper inseparability of the two natures of Christ, both as to time and space (Art. III), the objective force of the Word and Sacraments (V), the reality of the presence of both the heavenly and earthly elements in the Lord's Supper (X), the true value of private, that is, of individual absolution (XI), the genuine character of sacramental grace (XIII), the true medium in regard to the rites of the Church (XV), the freedom of the will (XVII), and the proper doctrine concerning the cause of sin (XIX). On all these points the Augsburg Confession presents views which, either in matter or measure, are opposed to extremes, which claim to be Protestant and Evangelical. Pelagianizing,

Rationalistic, Fatalistic, Fanatical, unhistorical tendencies, which, more or less unconsciously, have revealed themselves, both in Romanism and in various types of nominally Evangelical Protestantism, are all met and condemned by the letter, tenor, or spirit of these articles."

5) A few days after the presentation of the Augsburg Confession, the Romish theologians were directed to prepare a paper as an answer. This confutation was formally presented to the Diet on August 3. It reviewed in regular order the Articles of the Augsburg Confession, endorsing some and condemning others. The Evangelical princes and theologians almost immediately resolved upon a formal reply. A conference, however, of fourteen, seven representing the Lutherans, and seven representing the Romanists, was first held (August 13—21), in which the whole subject was discussed, but no satisfactory result was reached. The preparation of the *Apology* was entrusted to the evangelical theologians in general, although circumstances afterward made it the peculiar work of Melanchthon. It was fortunate that the Emperor refused to accept the first draught of the Apology offered on September 22, for that refusal has substituted for Melanchthon's sketch the Apology as we now have it. On September 23, Melanchthon left Augsburg with the Elector of Saxony, and at once began to elaborate still further the Apology upon the basis of his former draught. His letters from November, 1530, to April, 1531, show how deeply he was absorbed by it. Toward the close of April, 1531, the first edition of the Apology appeared, in quarto, bound with the Augsburg Confession. This is the original Latin edition, the German text, translated by Justus Jonas, under the supervision and with the

co-operation of Melanchthon, not appearing until October 1531. One year after its first publication, in April, 1532, at the Conference held at Schweinfurth, the Apology was publicly approved by the Evangelical Estates as a Confession of Faith. In 1537, at Smalcald, the Apology, at the request of the Princes, was *thoroughly compared* with the Augsburg Confession by the theologians, and then, as consonant with the Holy Scriptures and the Confession, *formally subscribed* by them with the declaration that they "held and taught in their churches according to the articles of the Confession and Apology."

And it deserves the place our Church has given to it. It is written with an inimitable clearness, distinctness and simplicity which must carry conviction alike to the learned and unlearned. It is more than a polemical treatise. The doctrine of justification by faith alone, without works, is established by Melanchthon in the Apology with greater accuracy than anywhere else. In doctrine it is as pure as the Confession to whose vindication it is consecrated. Dr. Jacobs truly says: "To one charged with the care of souls the frequent reading of the Apology is invaluable, on account of the manner in which it solves difficulties connected with the most vital points in Christian experience; while the private Christian, although perhaps compelled to pass by some portions occupied with learned discussions, will find in many — we may say, in most — parts, what is in fact a book of practical religion."[1]

Of the second and third chapters of the Apology (of Justification, and of Love and the Fulfilling of the Law) PHILIPPI says *(Kirch. Gl.* V. I., p. 36) : "If the Epistle

[1] See Historical Introduction to the *Book of Concord*, Vol. 2, p. 41.

to the Romans can be called the centre and the crown, the very kernel and star, of the entire Scriptures, so likewise we can affirm this of these two articles of the Apology in their relation to the entire contents of the confessional writings of our Church, — so clearly are they grounded in Scripture and experience, so triumphant, edifying, and consoling is their development."

6) The *Smalcald Articles* were prepared in the expectation that a free General Council would be held in Mantua, May 23, 1537. This council, however, did not convene until 1545, at Trent, and then was an exclusive Roman Catholic Council, the famous Council of Trent (1545—1563). The Elector of Saxony wished to have a new statement of the great doctrinal principles of our Church, especially touching those questions which would arise at the Council as matters of discussion between Lutherans and Romanists. He, therefore, asked Luther to prepare such articles as a basis, and to report before January 25, 1537. These articles were prepared by Luther, and having been approved by his colleagues, were sent to the Elector, January 3, 1537. The Articles thus prepared were taken to the Convention of the Evangelical States, held at Smalcald, Feb., 1537. There they were thoroughly examined by our great theologians and by them subscribed, February 15, and from the place where they were signed, came to be called the *Smalcald Articles*. The reasons why this new Confession was prepared are thus stated by DR. KRAUTH:[1] 1) The *Augsburg Confession had too much,* in some respects, for the object in view. The object in view, in 1537, was to compare the points of controversy between the Lutherans and the Romanists... The Augsburg Confession had done its great work in correcting

[1] *Conservative Reformation*, pp. 281—283.

misrepresentations of our Church,...and it was now desirable that...she should the more clearly express herself on the points of difference. 2) The *Augsburg Confession had too little* for a perfect exhibition of the full position of our Church as to the errors of Rome. 3) The *A. C. was not in the right key* for the work now to be done...The motion of the *A. C.* was to the flute, the *S. A.* moved to the peals of the clarion, and the roll of the kettle-drum. In the *A. C.* truth makes her overtures of peace, in the *S. A.* she lays down her ultimatum in a declaration of war. 4) That which was *secondary* in the *A. C.* is *primary* in the *Smalcald Articles*...In these Articles Luther presents directly the principles of the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church, and of the Romish See, in their conflict."

At the request of the Elector, Melanchthon while at Smalcald, prepared an Appendix to the Smalcald Articles on "The Power and Primacy of the Pope," about which the Augsburg Confession and Apology are silent. Of this Appendix Dr. Schaff in his *Creeds of Christendom* (vol. 1, p. 256) says: "The Appendix of Melanchthon is a theological masterpiece for his age, written in a calm, moderate, and scholarly tone, refuting, from the Bible and from the history of the Early Church, these three assumptions of the Pope, as 'false, impious, tyrannical, and pernicious in the extreme,' viz.: 1) That the Pope, as the Vicar of Christ, has by divine right supreme authority over the bishops and pastors of the whole Christian world; 2) That he has by divine right both swords, that is, the power to enthrone and dethrone kings, and to regulate civil affairs; 3) That Christians are bound to believe this at the risk of eternal salvation. He also shows from Scripture and from Jerome that the power and jurisdiction of Bishops, so

far as it differs from that of other ministers, is of human origin, and has been grossly abused in connection with the papal tyranny."

Of the Smalcald Articles and Melanchthon's Appendix, Köllner in his *Symbolik* says: "For our Church these writings must ever remain very weighty, and the more because outside of them there is nowhere else in the Symbols so ample a statement *about* the Papacy, and what is to be noted well, so ample a statement *against* it." (Quoted by Dr. Krauth in *Conservative Reformation,* p. 283).

7) In chronological order, as writings, the *two Catechisms,* which appeared in 1529, would have preceded the Augsburg Confession, following directly after the three General Creeds, but in the *Book of Concord* they follow the Smalcald Articles because of their later symbolical authority. During the visitation of the Churches of Saxony in 1528 and 1529, as one of a commission appointed by the Elector, Luther found the religious wants of the people greatly neglected. To provide for this want he prepared his two *Catechisms.* The question which of the two Catechisms was published first, has been differently answered, but recent criticism has established the fact, that the *Large Catechism* appeared about March or April, 1529, while the *Small Catechism* was not published until about July or August, 1529. Although these two Catechisms are the private writings of Luther, composed by him on his own authority and solely for the sake of instruction, they attained symbolical authority for their inherent worth.

8) The history of the preparation of the *Formula of Concord* may be divided into three parts: I. The events which rendered necessary the preparation of a new Confession. 1. The first cause were the vacillations of

Melanchthon. He thought that peace could be restored by ambiguous formulas, accepted indeed by both parties, but understood in different senses. The three works of Melanchthon in which the changes were most noted and most mischievous are a) the Augsburg Confession; b) the Apology; and c) his *Loci Communes*. 2. The second cause was the conflict between the *Philippists* or adherents of Melanchthon, and the more consistent *Lutherans*. Unfortunately much that Melanchthon wrote could be taken in two senses. We have 28 volumes of Melanchthon's writings, and at this hour, impartial and learned men are not agreed as to what were his views on some of the profoundest questions of Church doctrine, on which Melanchthon was writing all his life. 3. Another reason why a new Confession was necessary arose from the controversy furnished by the Melanchthonian *Corpus Doctrinæ* of 1560, to which the adherents of Melanchthon desired to give confessional authority, an effort which was resisted by the consistent Lutherans on the ground a) that is was largely composed of private writings on which no official action of the Church had been taken; b) that the texts of its most important parts were greatly changed and corrupted; and c) that it was ambiguous on some vital points, and unsound on others. 4. Another reason lay in the fact that the Wittenberg theologians embodied Crypto-Calvinistic doctrines in their various writings. 5. This alarming state of things (1569) led to various consultations on the part of our theologians, who were very anxious to save the Church from internal discord. Chief among them were James Andreæ (d. 1590), Martin Chemnitz (d. 1586), David Chytræus (d. 1600), and Nicholas Selneccer (d. 1592), all of them great theologians, moderate in spirit, earnest Christians, and in-

tensely devoted to the purity and peace of the Church. 6. In 1573 James Andreæ prepared an exposition of the existing controversies. Taking this "Exposition" as a basis Chemnitz and Chytræus elaborated it, and in 1575 it appeared as the Suabian-Saxon Formula of Concord. It was this formula which became a general groundwork of the Formula of Concord.

II. The second part of the history of the preparation of the Formula of Concord treats of the events terminating in the preparation of the Torgau Formula of 1576. 1. In 1576 Elector Augustus asked for a clear statement of the points at issue. This was furnished him in a paper, which was simply an abridgment of the Suabian-Saxon Formula, with proof passages from Scripture, and citations from Luther added. 2. This document was submitted to a number of theologians, delegates of the various princes, at a convention held at the cloister of Maulbrunn, January 19, 1576. It was examined and approved by them and is known as the *Maulbrunn Formula.* 3. In May, 1576, there was a convention of 18 theologians, of different lands, at Torgau. The most distinguished were Andreæ, Chytræus, Chemnitz, Selneccer, Musculus, and Koerner. They examined carefully the Suabian-Saxon Formula of 1575, and its abridgment, the Maulbrunn Formula, and resolved to form a new formula on the basis of the Suabian-Saxon Formula. Thus originated the *Formula of Torgau,* in 1576, after the toils and anxieties of seven years.

III. The third period of the history of the *Formula of Concord* opens with the sending forth of the *Torgau Formula* for examination by the Churches (1576), and ends with the publication of the *Book of Concord,* 1580. 1. The Formula of Torgau was everywhere received with interest. In the course of three months 20 con-

ventions of theologians were held. The Formula was scrutinized in every part. The great mass of the 25 responses testified to a general approval of the Formula, but it was clear that the document had not yet reached the shape in which it could fully meet the wants of the Church. 2. As soon as these answers were received, the Elector Angustus called together the three greatest of the co-workers, Chemnitz of Brunswick, Andreæ of Tuebingen, and Selneccer of Leipsic, to revise the Torgau Formula in the light of the expressed judgments of the Churches. They met at the cloister of Bergen, near Magdeburg. Here the Torgau Formula was submitted to the *first* revision, March 1—14, 1577. 3. The second and *final* revision took place at the same place, May 19—28, 1577. But to the first Triumvirate, Chytræus, Musculus, and Kœrner had been added. Though they examined the Formula with minute care, they found little to change. 4. We now know it as the *Bergen Formula,* but it was to be known in history as the *Formula of Concord,* for this it was. Between this time and its publication in 1580, in the Book of Concord, no change whatever was made in it.[1]

4. *The Church Doctrine as consisting of Articles of Faith.*

Hollaz defines an article of faith as "a part of the doctrine revealed in the written Word of God, concerning God and divine things, set forth to be believed by the sinner to his salvation."

These Articles of Faith are divided, according to their contents into "pure" and "mixed" articles.

Pure articles of faith treat of those divine mysteries

[1] On the history of the Formula of Concord, see especially KRAUTH'S *Conservative Reformation,* pp. 289—328, from which this note has been condensed. Also JACOBS' *Book of Concord,* Vol. 2, pp. 51—61, and the literature there cited.

which transcend the capacity of unaided human reason, which yet are divinely revealed in the Word of God and are simply matters of faith, as the article concerning the Trinity, the union of the divine and human natures in Christ, etc.

Mixed articles are those parts of Christian doctrine which are known to some extent from the light of nature, as the being and attributes of God, etc. Quenstedt, however, says of such mixed articles, that "they are not believed so far as they are known by the light of nature, but in so far as they are known by divine revelation." The mixed articles coalesce with the so-called religion of nature. "Rationalism," says Hase, "finds the source of Christianity in the mixed articles, in the pure, only the phenomenon."

According to their importance, articles of faith are divided into "fundamental" and "non-fundamental" articles.

The "fundamental" articles are those which are intimately connected with the *foundation of the faith*, which cannot be unknown, or at least not denied, consistently with faith and salvation.

"The foundation of the faith," is either *substantial* or *dogmatic*. The "substantial" foundation of the faith and salvation is Christ, since he is the meritorious cause of obtaining from God forgiveness of sins and eternal life. The "dogmatic" foundation of the faith is the collection of doctrines divinely revealed, by which Christ, the substantial foundation of the faith, and the sources and means of salvation necessarily connected therewith, are set forth. But the substantial and the dogmatic foundation of the faith are not two foundations essentially contradistinguished from each other, nor do they differ as to their subject-matter. For Christ is the

foundation, as to the subject-matter; the doctrine concerning Christ is the foundation, as to our knowledge (HOLLAZ).

The "fundamental" articles are divided into "primary fundamental" articles, without the knowledge of which no one can attain unto eternal salvation, or which must be known in order for any one to hold the foundation of the faith and secure salvation, and the "secondary fundamental" articles, which one may be ignorant of, but dare not deny, much less oppose, without injury to the foundation of faith (QUENSTEDT).

The "primary fundamental" articles are subdivided into 1) constituent, 2) antecedent, and 3) consequent articles of faith.

The "constituent" articles of faith are those which immediately and most nearly relate to our salvation, and intrinsically constitute and cause faith, such as the doctrines of the Trinity, of Sin, of the Word of God, of Regeneration, of Conversion, of Justification, of the universal Atonement and Merits of Christ, of Faith, etc.

The "antecedent" articles are those which do not, indeed, cause justifying and saving faith, nor are absolutely and immediately necessary to its existence, but which are, nevertheless, necessary to the complete and permanent establishment of those doctrines which produce and constitute faith, as the doctrines of the existence of God, of Divine Revelation, of the Divinity of Christ, of the Sinfulness of Man, of the Divine and Human Natures of Christ, of the Resurrection of the Dead, of the Last Judgment, etc.

The "consequent" articles are those which so necessarily follow established faith, that if they be not held, faith itself again is lost, as the doctrines of the Eternal

Duration of God, the Executive Justice of God, the Regal Office of Christ, of Baptism, the Lord's Supper, the Mystical Union, of Sanctification, of the Church, etc. (After HOLLAZ).

The "secondary fundamental" articles are those, a simple want of acquaintance with which does not prevent our salvation, but the pertinacious denial of, and hostility to, will overturn the foundation of faith, as the characteristic peculiarities of the Divine Persons, of the Intercommunication of Attributes in Christ, of Original Sin, of Predestination, etc.

The "non-fundamental" articles of faith are parts of the Christian doctrine which one may be ignorant of, or deny, and yet be saved, as the question of the Time of Creation, of the Cause of the Fall of the Angels, of the Character of Antichrist, of the Origin of the Soul, etc. But at the same time we must be careful even in the treatment of these articles, because under certain circumstances these non-fundamental articles may become in their relation to other articles, fundamental.

This distinction between "fundamental" and "non-fundamental" articles has been drawn by our dogmaticians to make clear the doctrinal differences between the Lutheran Church, on the one side, and the Reformed and Roman Catholic Churches, on the other side.

To the true unity of the Church a hearty and honest consent is required in the fundamental Articles of Faith. But here the question arises what doctrines are *fundamental?* PHILIPPI says:[1] "The expiatory death of the God-man, through which the restoration of com-

[1] *Kirchl. Glaubenslehre,* I. (Third Edition), pp. 112—115. For a translation of this whole discussion of Philippi on "What is a fundamental Doctrine?" (pp. 112—124), see JACOBS' *Book of Concord,* Vol. 2, pp. 321—327. On the general subject compare RUDELBACH'S *Reformation, Lutherthum und Union,* Chap. 12, pp. 540—608.

munion with God is imparted, and upon which it is founded, forms both the centre and the *foundation* of salvation... Dogmatic theology is nothing more than the development, in its various directions, of this central fundamental doctrine... The one fundamental doctrine forming the centre sets forth in itself the various ideas and doctrines of salvation that it contains; and therefore everything thus developed by inner necessity from this centre is just as fundamental as the centre itself. Thus, about the *central* fundamental doctrine (the constitutive articles, specially so called) the entire collection of *peripheral* fundamental doctrines (consecutive articles) is formed, which again, on their part, enclose the centre in wider or narrower concentric circles. ...There is, therefore, a continuous series of divine fundamental facts, and of divine fundamental testimonies corresponding to these facts, which taken together extend back to the centre, namely, the fact of redemption and the doctrine of redemption, and proceed therefrom... But we have to consider not only the distinction between the central and the concentric or peripheral, but also the distinction between that which is *immediately* and that which is *mediately fundamental.* To the "immediately fundamental" belong all such doctrines as relate to divine facts which still continue to form the ground of our salvation, — the facts of creation, of redemption, and of sanctification. Here there is indeed that which is central and peripheral, but all is immediately fundamental.

On the other hand, the 'mediate fundamental' doctrines are such as either refer to divine facts, which, if they formerly constituted the foundation of our salvation, constitute it no longer (as the original creation in the divine image), or as are not properly acts pertain-

ing to salvation, but only acts preparatory to those of salvation, or acts of judgment following the rejection of the acts of salvation; or as refer to human acts (as the original and continued fall of man from God), to which the divine facts of judgment and salvation stand in the closest relation. But even these 'mediate fundamental' doctrines still remain fundamental doctrines, in so far as they not only are inwardly connected with the immediate peripheral fundamental doctrines, but also have been organically developed with them from the one central fundamental doctrine; so that a holding in its purity of these doctrines, or an alteration of the same, must be reciprocal, as has actually been found to occur."

On the other hand FRANK[1] says, and in substance with him agrees Luthardt: "A new elaboration of the doctrine of fundamental statements is certainly needed, since the form of the same thus far presented from Nicholas Hunnius to Philippi is objectionable from the fact that it seeks mostly to draw the distinction according to an entirely objective rule, according to the knowledge necessary for salvation...In fact, the dogmaticians, in drawing the distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals, have not manifested a very clear perception — not merely that they are everywhere in doubt whether to designate a doctrine as non-fundamental, and evidently do not agree with each other in the statement of the same, but even when they have taken courage to name a doctrine as non-funda-

[1] In his *Theologie der Concordienformel*, Vol. 1, pp. 17—20, Erlangen, 1858. This passage is also translated by Dr. Jacobs in *Book of Concord*, Vol. 2, pp. 327—329. (Philippi, in his third edition, in a foot-note (p. 124) remarks, that as far as he can see, there is an essential agreement between Frank and himself, and that the only difference is that his own presentation is developed further.)

mental, — as, for example, that of the Immortality of Man before the Fall, that of the Sin and Eternal Damnation of the Wicked Angels, or of Antichrist, — they immediately add one restriction to another, whereby the denial of such article may be prejudicial to the conditions of salvation...

That which is absolutely fundamental is only one, namely, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. But this occurs in an organic way. Jesus Christ is the living, all-penetrating centre, the kernel and star of the entire Holy Scriptures. Every part of revelation depends organically, and after the manner of members upon him. Thus viewed, everything is fundamental, and just, as in reference to the law of the Lord he who sins in one point is guilty of all, so also especially in reference to the revelation of salvation, he who attacks a single member, offers violence to the whole organism itself and to its Head. And, thus considered, there still remains only one thing that is fundamental; for as love is the fulfilling of the law, and all else is comprehended in this one thing, so also he who believes in the Lord Jesus Christ, has the entire organism of salvation, with all else comprised in it which is necessary for blessedness.

The question, according to the change from that which is relative in the fundamental to that which is absolute, is, then, to be decided in accordance with the position, at the time, of the believing individual to the organism of salvation. If an individual Christian or a Christian congregation has at any time learned to know any part of the saving revelation as a member of the organism, this part, whether it appear in itself large or small, becomes to that individual or congregation forever fundamental. For with the despising or rejection

of even the least matter there is a despising and rejection of the organism itself, whose life supports and passes through even those things which are least. The Church, which in its course through the world has organized, and in its symbols has fixed as such, one portion of saving truth after another, can therefore consider none of the same otherwise than fundamental.

For the Church, I say, everything is fundamental that it has obtained, in reference to doctrine, from the Scriptures and has fixed in its Confessional writings; and here is the point in which every union in doctrine between two churches must be frustrated. But *in the Church* there exists partly that which is equally, partly that which is less, and partly also that which is more, fundamental than that of the Church itself. Of the shepherds and teachers of the Church such a degree of knowledge must as a rule be required, that to them everything, even to the least point, is fundamental which is fundamental to the Church.

But to the laity only such a degree of faith is, as a rule, to be demanded that, founded upon that which is absolutely fundamental, they may gradually grow up, under the training of the Church, to the heights of Churchly knowledge.

Finally, in a still smaller number, whose personal knowledge of salvation is more comprehensive than that of the Church, the extent of that which is fundamental is increased in proportion as they have entered, in a still greater degree than the Confession, into the depths and remote places of the organism of salvation."

5. *The Fundamental Principles of Faith of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of North America.*[1]

The growth of Church consciousness has been a marked feature of the later life of the Lutheran Church in this country. Its outgrowth has been the organization of the *General Council* in 1867, and of the *Synodical Conference* in 1872.

[1] The Lutheran Church in this country (1894) consists in round numbers of 5,400 ministers, 9,200 congregations, and 1,400,000 of communing members. It is divided into 60 Synods, and organized under 4 General bodies: 1) General Synod, North, since 1821; 2) General Council, since 1867; 3) Synodical Conference, since 1872; 4) United Synod South, since 1886.

The first, the *General Synod*, is largely unionistic, but with growing elements of a more churchly character in faith and practice. There are two elements in it, the one laying a greater stress on the distinctive doctrines and usages of Lutheranism, and the other warmly encouraging all syncretistic plans of union.

The second general body, the *General Council*, is strictly Lutheran in confession, but in the practical application of its principles in discipline, especially on the "four points" in controversy ("pulpit and altar fellowship, Chiliasm and Secret Societies"), has failed to satisfy the Synodical Conference, and several Independent Synods, as the Iowa and Ohio Synods. Even among the nine Synods comprising the General Council there has been some difference in the application of the principles involved in the "four points," some applying them more strictly than others, but, in general, the great work of the General Council has been, and is, to educate the mind of the Church, and to protest against all unionistic tendencies, secret associations, and all errors in doctrine, endeavoring to solve the great problem of the Lutheran Church of this country, how to unite the various nationalities, speaking different languages (English, German, Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, Finnish, Icelandic, etc.), into one body, harmonious in faith and practice.

The *Synodical Conference*, the outgrowth of the Synod of Missouri, has been by pre-eminence the representative of Lutheran Orthodoxy, and has been noted for its strong testimony against all unionistic tendencies, for its unflinching stand against all errors in doctrine, and especially for its bold denouncement of all secret organizations.

The *United Synod, South*, the smallest of the four general bodies, is churchly and conservative, strictly Lutheran in confession, and in practice more in harmony with the General Council than with the General Synod.

The strict confessionalism of the General Council can be seen from its statements of the "fundamental and unchangeable" *Principles of Faith*[1], which lie as

[1] "1) There must be and abide through all time, one holy Christian Church, which is the assembly of all believers, among whom the Gospel is purely preached, and the Holy Sacraments are administered, as the Gospel demands.

To the true Unity of the Church, it is sufficient that there be agreement touching the doctrine of the Gospel, that it be preached in one accord, in its pure sense, and that the Sacraments be administered conformably to God's Word.

2) The true Unity of a particlar Church, in virtue of which men are truly members of one and the same Church, and by which any Church abides in real identity, and is entitled to a continuation of her name, is unity in doctrine and faith and in the Sacraments, to-wit: That she continues to teach and to set forth, and that her true members embrace from the heart, and use, the articles of faith and the Sacraments as they were held and administered when the Church came into distinctive being and received a distinctive name.

3) The Unity of the Church it witnessed to, and made manifest in the solemn, public and official Confessions which are set forth, to-wit: The generic Unity of the Christian Church in the general Creeds, and the specific Unity of pure parts of the Christian Church in their specific Creeds; one chief object of both classes of which Creeds is, that Christians who are in the Unity of faith, may know each other as such, and may have a visible bond of fellowship.

4) That Confessions may be such a testimony of Unity and bond of Union, they must be accepted in every statement of doctrine, in their own true, native, original and only sense. Those who set them forth and subscribe them, must not only agree to use the same words, but must use and understand those words in one and the same sense.

5) The Unity of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, as a portion of the holy Christian Church, depends upon her abiding in one and the same faith, in confessing which she obtained her distinctive being and name, her political recognition, and her history.

6) The Unaltered Augsburg Confession is by pre-eminence the Confession of that faith. The acceptance of its doctrines and the avowal of them without equivocation or mental reservation, make, mark and identify that Church, which alone in the true, original, historical and honest sense of the term is the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

7) The only Churches, therefore, of any land, which are properly in the Unity of that Communion, and by consequence entitled to its name, Evangelical Lutheran, are those which sincerely hold and truthfully confess the doctrines of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession.

the basis of its Constitution. KRAUTH[1]: "Accepting these principles, we stand upon the everlasting foundation—the Word of God: believing that the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament are in their original tongues, and in a pure text, the perfect and only rule of faith... Not any word of man, no creed, commentary, theological system, or decision of Fathers or of Councils, no doctrines of Churches, or of the whole Church, no results or judgments of reason, however strong, matured, and well informed, no one of these, and not all of these together, but God's Word alone is the rule of faith. No apocryphal books, but the canonical books alone are the rule of faith...

As the acceptance of the Word of God as a Rule of Faith separates us from the Mohammedan, as the reception of the New Testament sunders us from the Jew, as the hearty acquiescence in the Apostles', Nicene and Athanasian Creeds shows us, in the face of all

8) We accept and acknowledge the doctrines of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession in its original sense as throughout in conformity with the pure truth of which God's Word is the only rule. We accept its statements of truth as in perfect accordance with the Canonical Scriptures. We reject the errors it condemns, and believe that all which it commits to the liberty of the Church, of right belongs to that liberty.

9) In thus formally accepting and acknowledging the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, we declare our conviction, that the other Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, inasmuch as they set forth none other than its system of doctrine, and articles of faith, are of necessity pure and Scriptural. Pre-eminent among such accordant, pure and Scriptural statements of doctrine, by their intrinsic excellence, by the great and necessary ends for which they were prepared, by their historical position, and by the general judgment of the Church, are these: the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, the Catechisms of Luther, and the Formula of Concord, all of which are, with the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, in perfect harmony of one and the same Scriptural faith."

[1] Condensed from Dr. Krauth's *Conservative Reformation*, pp. 165—169. Dr. Krauth also was the author of "The Principles of Faith and Church Polity," which were adopted, as the basis of the Constitution of the General Council, at Reading, Pa., 1866.

errorists of the earlier ages, to be in the faith of the Church Catholic, so does our unreserved acceptance of the Augsburg Confession mark us as Lutherans; and the acceptance of the Apology, the Catechisms of Luther, the Smalcald Articles, and the Formula of Concord, continues the work of marking our separation from all errorists of every shape, whose doctrines are in conflict with the true sense of the Rule of Faith—that Rule whose teachings are rightly interpreted and faithfully embodied in the Confessions afore-mentioned. Therefore, God helping us, we will teach the whole faith of His Word, which faith our Church sets forth, explains, and defends in her Symbols. We do not interpret God's Word by the Creed, neither do we interpret the Creed by God's Word, but interpreting both independently, by the laws of language, and finding that they teach one and the same truth, we heartily acknowledge the Confession as a true exhibition of the faith of the Rule,—a true witness to the one, pure, and unchanging faith of the Christian Church."

6. *The Consciousness of Faith.*

By the consciousness of faith we mean that internal assurance and inner possession which the dogmatician has of those saving truths of Christianity, which the Scriptures reveal and the Church teaches. It is this inner consciousness of faith which is the starting-point and the source of the production of doctrine in a dogmatic system, but such a presentation of doctrine must be based on the Word of God as the Rule of Faith, and compared with the doctrine of the Church.

§ 14. The Disposition of Dogmatics.

The division of the material is suggested by the contents and the aim of Dogmatics, namely, the delineation of that fellowship with God on the part of man, which has come into historic being in Christ. The arrangement has been made sometimes synthetically, sometimes analytically, sometimes in accordance with the three articles of the Apostles' Creed, and sometimes in the historic order of the development of its great leading parts.

LUTHARDT, after his "Prolegomena" (§§ 1—14) and "History of Dogmatics" (§§ 15—21) presents his system under six heads:

1) The Establishment of the Fellowship of God in the Will of God's Eternal Love (§§ 22—32);

2) The Creation of Man and of the World which has been given to him, as the beginning of the historical Actualizing of the Divine Love and Purpose (§§ 33—39);

3) The Disruption of the Original Fellowship of God through Sin, and the Preparation for its Restoration (§§ 40—45);

4) The Restoration of the Fellowship of God in Christ Jesus (§§ 46—56);

5) The Appropriation of the Fellowship of God restored in Christ Jesus (§§ 57—74);

6) The Completion of the Fellowship of God or The Last Things (§§ 75—79).

Martensen, Marheineke and Kahnis follow the order of the articles of the Apostles' Creed:

1) The Doctrine of the Father;
2) The Doctrine of the Son;
3) The Doctrine of the Spirit.

Philippi divides his system into five parts and follows the order of the historical actualizing of the Fellowship of Man with God:

1) The Original Fellowship of God;
2) The Disruption of the Fellowship of God ;
3) The Restoration of the Fellowship of God;
   a) Of Election and the Person of Christ.
   b) Of the Work of Christ.
4) The Appropriation of the Fellowship of God;
   a) The Order of Salvation.
   b) The Means of Grace.
   c) The Doctrine of the Church.
5) The Completion of the Fellowship of God.

And so in substance the systems of Thomasius and Frank, though otherwise formulated.

In our own system we will follow the order of Luthardt's *Kompendium,* but instead of his main divisions as given above, we will employ the technical expressions generally used in the synthetic method. In order to present the whole system of Dogmatic theology before the eye of the student, we herewith give an outline, according to which the subject-matter of Dogmatics will be treated.

Prolegomena or Introduction (§§ 1—21).

PART. I.

Theologia or the Doctrine of God (§§ 22—37).

§ 22. The Treatment of the Doctrine of God.
§ 23. The Natural Revelation of God and its Limits.
   1. The Significance of Revelation.
   2. The Definition of Revelation.
   3. General Revelation.

§ 24. The so-called Proofs of the Existence of God.
1. Proofs derived from Reflection on the World.
2. Proofs derived from Reflection of man upon himself.

§ 25. The Supernatural Revelation of God.
1. The Fact of Revelation.
2. The Definition of Revelation.
3. The Constituent parts of Revelation.
4. The Contents of Revelation.
5. The Nature of Revelation.

§ 26. The Necessity, Possibility, and Actuality of Supernatural Revelation.
1. The Necessity of Supernatural Revelation.
2. Its Possibility.
3. The Relation of Reason and Revelation.
4. The Actuality and Truth of Revelation.

§ 27. God as the Absolute Personality.
1. The Question of the Knowableness of God.
2. The Definition of the Absolute and of Personality.
3. The Personality of God.
4. Pantheism and Theism.
5. The History of the Notion of God apart from the Biblical one.
6. The Biblical Notion of God.
7. The Churchly Theology.

§ 28. God as Holy Love.
1. God as Essential Goodness.
2. God as perfect Holiness.
3. God as Tender Love.

§ 29. The Doctrine of the Divine Attributes.
1. The Definition of the Divine Attributes, and of their Relation to the Divine Essence.
2. Manner of Determining the Attributes.
3. Division of the Attributes.
4. The Particular Attributes.

§ 30. The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity.
1. The Doctrine of The Old Testament.
2. The Doctrine of the New Testament.
   1) The self-witness of Jesus.
   2) The Apostolic Declarations.
   3) The New Testament Doctrine of the Holly Ghost.
   4) The Co-ordination of the Three Persons.

§ 31. The Church Doctrine of the Trinity.
1. The History of the Doctrine.
2. The Dogmatic Formulation.
3. Explanatory Analogies and Scientific Deductions.
4. Attacks upon the Church Doctrine of the Trinity.
§ 32. Doctrine of the Decree of God, or of Predestination.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.
§ 33. The Doctrine of Creation.
1. Biblical Account of Creation.
2. Definition of Creation.
3. The Essential Dogmatic Determinations.
§ 34. The Doctrine of Providence.
1. Transcendence and Immanence.
2. The Certainty of Providence.
3. The Definition of Providence.
4. The Object of Providence.
5. The Form of Providence.
6. The Aim of Providence.
7. Antitheses to the true Doctrine.
§ 35. The Doctrine of Miracles.
1. Miracles of Scripture.
2. Miracles in the Church.
3. Definition of Miracles.
4. The Possibility of Miracles.
5. The Necessity of Miracles.
6. The Actuality of Miracles.
7. The Divisions of Miracles.
§ 36. The Doctrine of Angels.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.
3. Modern Criticism.
§ 37. The Doctrine concerning Satan.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.
3. Modern Criticism.

PART II.

Anthropologia or the Doctrine of Man (§§ 38—44).

§ 38. Man.
1. Creation of Man.

2. The Essential Constituents of Man.
3. The Unity of the Human Race.
4. The Propagation of the Soul.

§ 39. The Original Condition of Man.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

§ 40. The Fall.
1. The Biblical Account.
2. The Historical Actuality of the Fall.
3. Attempts to explain away the Historical Facts.

§41. Original Sin.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.
3. Modern Criticism.

§ 42. The Essential Character of Sin.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

§ 43. Actual Sins.
1. General Definition of Sins of Act.
2. Divisions of Sins of Act.

§44. Moral Bondage, or the Doctrine of Free Will.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

PART III.

Christologia or the Doctrine of the Person of Christ (§§ 45—51).

§ 45. The Historical Preparation for Salvation.
1. Beginning of the History of Divine Revelation.
2. The Heathen World.
3. Israel.

§ 46. The Postulate of the divine-human Mediator.
1. The Necessity of the Atonement.
2. The Ground of the Incarnation.
3. The Person of Christ.

§ 47. The Reality and the Integrity of the Two Natures of Christ.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

§ 48. The God-Man.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.

2. The Historical Unfolding of the Church Doctrine.
§ 49. Doctrine of the Dogmaticians concerning the God-Man.
1. Unitio or Incarnation.
2. The Personal Union.
3. The Communion of Natures.
4. The Personal Propositions.
5. The Communicatio Idiomatum.
1) Genus Idiomaticum.
2) Genus Majestaticum.
3) Genus Apotelesmaticum.
§ 50. The Humiliation of Christ.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.
§ 51. The Modern Development of the Christological Dogma.

PART IV.

Soteriologia or the Doctrine of the Work of Christ (§§ 52—56).

§ 52. The Mediatorial Office of Christ.
1. Jesus is the Mediator.
2. The three-fold Office of Christ.
§ 53. The Prophetic Office.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.
§ 54. The Scripture Doctrine of the Atonement.
1. The Testimony of the Universal Human Moral Consciousness.
2. The Old Testament Doctrine concerning Sacrifice.
3. The Utterances of the Gospel in regard to the Sufferings of Christ.
4. The Utterances of the Apostles.
§ 55. The Church Doctrine of the Atonement.
1. The Ancient Church.
2. The Church of the Middle Ages.
3. The Reformation.
4. The Dogmaticians of the Seventeenth Century.
5. Further History of the Dogma.
§ 56. The Regal Office.
1. The Descent into Hell.
2. The Resurrection of Christ.

3. The Ascension to Heaven.
4. The Sitting at the Right Hand of the Father.
5. The Intercession.
6. The Kingdom of Christ.

PART V.

Pneumatologia or the Doctrine of the Work of the Holy Spirit (§§ 57—66).

§ 57. The Arrangement of the Material.

§ 58. The Grace of the Holy Spirit.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

§ 59. The Calling or Vocation.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

§ 60. Illumination.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

§ 61. Conversion.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

§ 62. Repentance.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

§ 63. Faith.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

§ 64. Justification.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

§ 65. Regeneration and the Mystical Union.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

§ 66. Sanctification, Renovation, Good Works.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

PART VI.

Ecclesiologia or the Doctrine Concerning the Church (§§ 67—74).

§ 67. The Essential Character and Attributes of the Church.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.
3. The later Development of the Doctrine of the Church.

§ 68. The Holy Scriptures.
1. The Testimony of Scripture to itself.
2. The Church Doctrine.
   1) The Ancient Catholic Church.
   2) The Church of the Middle Ages.
   3) The Roman Catholic Church.
   4) The Protestant Church.
   5) The Doctrine of the Dogmaticians.
   6) The more recent Development of the Doctrine concerning The Holy Scriptures.

§ 69. The Means of Grace.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

§ 70. The Word of God.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

§ 71. Baptism.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.
   1) The Ancient Catholic Church.
   2) The Church of the Middle Ages.
   3) The Protestant Church.

§ 72. The Lord's Supper.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.
   1) The Ancient Church.
   2) The Church of the Middle Ages and The Roman Catholic Church.
   3) The Reformation.
   4) The Dogmaticians.
   5) Modern Criticism of the Doctrine.

§ 73. The Sacraments.
1. The Ancient Catholic and Roman Church.

2. Protestantism.
3. Appendix: The Sacraments so-called of the Roman Church.

§ 74. The Doctrine of the Ministry.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

PART VII.

Eschatologia or the Doctrine of the Last Things (§§ 75—79).

§ 75. Life after Death. Immortality.
1. The Testimony of the Universal Human Consciousness.
2. The Scripture Doctrine concerning the State after Death.
3. The Church Doctrine.

§ 76. The Second Coming of Christ.
1. The Conversion of the Gentiles.
2. Antichrist.
3. The Second Coming of Christ.
4. The so-called Reign of a Thousand Years. Chiliasm.

§ 77. The General Resurrection.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

§ 78. The final Judgment and the End of the World.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

§ 79. Eternal Life and Eternal Death.
1. The Scripture Doctrine.
2. The Church Doctrine.

IV. THE HISTORY OF DOGMATICS.

§ 15. The Dogmatics of the Ancient Church.

The Theology of the Ancient Church was influenced by the prevailing philosophy of portions of the Church. It is the *patristic* theology, and so far from possessing the unity which is claimed for it by those who desire to give it an undue

authority, it is for its range the most diversified and conflicting, in manifold respects, of all the theologies of the various eras.

1. THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

We cannot properly speak of a *theology* of the Apostolic Fathers[1] (Clement of Rome, Author of Epistle to Diognetus, Polycarp, Ignatius, Barnabas, Papias) for they preserve and continue the Apostolic tradition, making continual reference to the oral preaching of the Apostles. The Apologists[2] of the second century (Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tatian, Theophilus, and Athenagoras) through their writings, by their refutation of the slanders of Jews and Gentiles, by their vindication of the truths of the Gospel and their attack of the errors and voices of idolatry, prepared the way for the speculations of the *Alexandrian School,* whose chief representatives are Clement of Alexandria and Origen.

[1] Of the three well-known editions of the original 1) Jacobson, 2) Hefele, 3) Gebhardt, Harnack, Zahn, the last is the most complete. For practical purposes the abridged edition of LIGHTFOOT'S "Apostolic Fathers" is the best. (1 vol. $4.00). On monographs, Lightfoot's *Clement of Rome* (2 vols.) and *Ignatius* and *Polycarp* (3 vols., 1885) are superior to anything that has ever been attempted before. They are commentaries, containing a revised Greek text, introductions, notes and dissertations.

The best English translation and most accessible is the one found in Vol. 1 of the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, published by "The Christian Literature Publishing Co.," 1885.

Compare also Church Histories of Schaff, Hase, Neander, and Kurtz, and Donaldson's *Apostolical Fathers*, London, 1874.

[2] For Bibliography of separate authors see Richardson's *Bibliographical Synopsis* to Ante-Nicene Fathers (Christian Literature Company, 1887). For students we would especially recommend Gildersleve's edition of the *Apologies* of Justin Martyr, and March's edition of Athenagoras, published by Harper & Bros., in the Douglass series of Christian, Greek and Latin writers.

2. THE ORIENTAL CHURCH.

1. *The School of Alexandria.*

1) CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA[1] (d. 220) after Justin Martyr and Irenæus, may be regarded as the founder of Christian literature. He became the successor of Pantænus in the Catechetical School of Alexandria (after 180 A. D.), and had Origen for his pupil, who succeeded him in 202 A. D. Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444) calls Clement "a man admirably learned and skilful, one that searched to the depths all the learning of the Greeks, with an exactness rarely attained before," and Eusebius (d. 340) praises him as an "incomparable master of Christian philosophy." His works are full of quotations from the older Greek authors. He aims to harmonize Greek philosophy and Christianity, and seeks to guide his readers from faith *(pistis)* to knowledge *(gnosis)* by the aid of philosophy.

His three great works 1) *The Exhortation to the Greeks,* 2) *The Instructor,* and 3) *The Miscellanies* or *Stromata,* are really parts of one whole system, representing three progressive stages in a systematic teach-

[1] To avoid burdening our pages with so many references, we here once for all call attention to the Encyclopædias and works of reference, which are of especial value to the student in the study of the lives, views, and writings of the different writers, theologians, and dogmaticians which are mentioned in this brief outline. and which have been more or less used in the preparation of these notes.

The *Encyclopædias* of Plitt-Hauck-Herzog, Schaff-Herzog, Alexander-Kitto, Johnson, McClintock-Strong, Smith-Wace, Encyclopædia Britannica, etc.; the *Church Histories* of Schaff, Hase, Neander, Kurtz, Robertson, Hagenbach, Herzog, Gieseler, Guericke, Hardwick, Milman, Mosheim, Neale, etc.; among the works on *History of Doctrines* and *of Dogmatics* we would mention the works of Kliefoth, Thomasius, Harnoch, Neander, Frank, Dorner, Hagenbach, H. Schmid, Shedd, Crippen, Harnack, etc.

We will refer in our foot-notes to special monographs, and to the more important works bearing on the topic or person under consideration.

ing of Christianity, and are among the most valuable remains of Christian antiquity.

These three works were composed by him during his residence as teacher in Alexandria, and in his "Exhortation," which is a work on Apologetics, he points out the unreasonableness and immorality of heathenism; in his "Instructor" or "Educator," which is a work on Ethics, he unfolds Christian morality, with constant reference to heathen practices; his "Miscellanies," a work of dogmatical character, aims to furnish the material for the construction of a Christian philosophy on the basis of faith. This last work, though written carelessly, is a storehouse of immense learning. Though his writings are rich in brilliant thoughts, abounding in passages of power and beauty, he often repeats himself and is lacking in clear, fixed method.

SCHAFF: "His theology is not a unit, but a confused eclectic mixture of Christian elements with many Stoic, Platonic, and Philonic ingredients... His ethical principles are those of the Hellenic philosophy, inspired by the genius of Christianity."

Though Clement has never been branded with heresy like Origen, still "in his utterances concerning the Son, the Philonic wavering between the theory of subordination and Modalism is not fully overcome" (UEBERWEG)[1], and his exegesis of Scripture was cast in the same fantastic allegorical mould as that of Origen, his pupil and successor.

2) ORIGEN[2] (d. 254) was the greatest scholar of all the Ante-Nicene Fathers, but he was by no means orthodox, either in the Roman Catholic or Protestant

[1] See his *History of Philosophy*, vol. 1., pp. 311—315 for a careful estimate of Clement as a philosopher and a theologian.

[2] For an English translation of his *De Principiis* and *Contra Celsum*, see Coxe's edition of the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 4, pp. 223—669.

sense. It is in his early dogmatic work *De Principiis*, i. e. on the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, that he lays himself open to charges of false doctrine.

The work of Origen is divided into four books: in the first, he treats of God, of Christ, of the Holy Ghost, of angels; in the second book, of the creation of the world, of the incarnation of Christ, of the soul, of the resurrection, of judgment, of punishment; in the third, of the freedom of the will, of sin, of the end of the world; in the fourth, of the inspiration of the Scriptures, their authority and interpretation, together with a summary of the doctrine of the Trinity, and of various other doctrines.

This was the first attempt to set forth a complete system of dogmatics, and is full of Platonizing and gnosticising errors, some of which Origen retracted in his later years.

The points on which Origen departed from the orthodox faith are mainly these:

1) His doctrine that the souls of men had previously existed, and that their punishment in material bodies was a punishment for sins which they had then committed;

2) His doctrine that the human soul of Christ had also previously existed and been united to the Divine nature before the Incarnation;

3) His doctrine of an eternal creation:

4) His denial of a material resurrection;

5) His doctrine of an universal restoration, that the work of redemption extends to the inhabitants of the stars, and that all men, the evil angels, and Satan himself, shall be finally restored;

6) Although he was the first to teach expressly the

eternal generation of the Son, yet in the great Christological controversies of the fourth century the Arians *(heteroousios)*, the Semi-Arians *(homoiousios)* and the Athanasians *(homoousios)*, all equally regarded Origen as on their side.

In this treatise *De Principiis* his principles of interpreting Scripture are also brought out, and although Origen may be regarded as the father of critical investigation of Scripture, and his greatest service was in exegesis, nevertheless his principles of exposition, though put forth by him in a devout spirit and with many cautions, have a tendency to subvert belief in the historical truth of Scripture.

SCHAFF: "His great defect is the neglect of the grammatical and historical sense and his constant desire to find a hidden mystic meaning. He even goes further in this direction than the Gnostics, who everywhere saw transcendental, unfathomable mysteries. His hermeneutical principle assumes a three-fold sense — literal, moral, and spiritual. His allegorical interpretation is ingenious, but often runs away from the text and degenerates into the merest caprice; while at times it gives way to the opposite extreme of a carnal literalism, by which he justifies his ascetic extravagance."

The treatise of Origen *Against Celsus* is a defence of Christianity in opposition to a Greek philosopher named Celsus, and is one of the ripest and most valuable of his productions. It was written in his old age (about 248) and is composed with care, and shows evidence of the widest learning. As the work is in stricter harmony with the orthodox teaching of the Church, it is only fair that we should judge Origen rather from the standpoint of his more mature work, than from his youthful production *De Principiis*.

2. *The New Alexandrian School.*

This school sincerely respected the memory of Origen, and in part followed in his footsteps in their speculative treatment of Christian doctrine. But they avoided his unbiblical errors, and simply consistently carried out what was sound in his teaching. Keeping clear of all *Subordinationism* the theologians of this school agreed more fully with the teachings of the divines of the *Western Church.* Its leading and most orthodox representatives were ATHANASIUS, the three great Cappadocians, GREGORY NAZIANZEN, BASIL THE GREAT, and GREGORY OF NYSSA, and DIDYMUS THE BLIND. The leaven of error again appeared in CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, although he was still regarded as orthodox. We may also, in this connection, refer to the CATECHESES of CYRIL OF JERUSALEM.

1) ATHANASIUS[1] (d. 373) is the theological centre of the Nicene age. The history of his life is the history of the Church during that period. The "father of orthodoxy," he is, on the whole, one of the purest and most imposing characters in the history of the Church, and no one of the Eastern Church fathers enjoyed so high consideration in the Western Church as Athanasius. His name is inseparable from the conflicts and the triumph of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. DR. SCHAFF[2] has well said: "He was (and there are few such) a theological and churchly character in magnificent, antique style. He was a man of one mould and one idea...St. Paul lived and labored for Christ crucified, Gregory VII. for the Roman hierarchy, Luther for the doctrine of justification by faith, Calvin for the

[1] The *Select Works and Letters* of Athanasius are reprinted in Vol. 4 of Second Series of *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.* New York, 1892.

[2] In his *History of the Christian Church*, vol. 3, p. 890.

idea of the sovereign grace of God. It was the passion and the life-work of Athanasius to vindicate the deity of Christ, which he rightly regarded as the corner-stone of the edifice of the Christian faith, and without which he could conceive no redemption."

He was present at the Council of Nicæa (325), and distinguished himself there by his zeal and ability in refuting Arianism and vindicating the eternal deity of Christ, — to which he devoted his whole future life. In 328 he succeeded Alexander as bishop of Alexandria, which office he held for forty-five years, during which period he was ten times banished, and passed twenty years in exile, mainly in the West.

His writings are mainly directed against Arianism, but his stormy life prevented him from composing a large systematic work. Among his dogmatic and controversial works in defence of the Nicene faith especially noteworthy are the *Four Orations against the Arians* (358), the *Four Epistles to Serapion* on the Deity of the Holy Spirit (358), and two books *Against Apollinaris*, in defence of the full humanity of Christ.

2) GREGORY NAZIANZEN[1] (d. 390), the Theologian (in the narrow sense of the word as the defender of the deity of the Logos), though inferior to his bosom friend Basil as a church ruler, and to Gregory of Nyssa as a speculative thinker, was superior to both as an orator, and with the exception, perhaps, of Chrysostom, was the greatest orator of the Greek Church. His life, with

[1] See Carl Ullman: *Gregorius von Nazianz, der Theologe.* Darmstadt, 1825. Translated (in part) by G. F. Cox. London, 1857. His most important dogmatic writings are his *Five Theological Orations* in defence of the Nicene doctrine against the Eunomians and Macedonians, delivered in Constantinople, and republished and edited by Goldhorn, in the second volume of Thilo's *Bibliotheca Patrum Græcorum Dogmatica.* Leipsic, 1854. English translation in vol. 7 of Second Series of *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.* New York, 1894.

its alternations of high station, monastic seclusion, love of severe studies, enthusiasm for poetry, nature, and friendship is intensely interesting (SCHAFF).

GASS[1]: "In christology Gregory opposed Arianism and Apollinarianism; in anthropology he teaches original sin, and derives the mortality of man from the fall. But he held to the ability of the human will to choose the good, and to the co-operation of man with God in salvation (influenced by Origen)."

3) BASIL THE GREAT[2] (Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia 370—379) had all the advantages of Christian training and classical and philosophical culture. His life, which is more interesting than a romance, was an illustration of strong faith, of self-denying love, of high aims, and of royal dignity. SCHAFF[3]: "Basil is distinguished as a pulpit orator and as a theologian, and still more as a shepherd of souls and a church ruler; and in the history of monasticism he holds a conspicuous place. In classical culture he yields to none of his contemporaries, and is justly placed with the two Gregories among the very first writers among the Greek fathers."

At first, fearing Sabellianism, he belonged to the middle party (the Homoiousians) in the great conflict between Arianism and Orthodoxy, but the persecutions of the Arians drove him to a positive confession of the Nicene faith, and it was by the power of his spirit and faith he preserved the Eastern Church during

[1] In SCAFF-HERZOG'S *Encyclopædia.*

[2] His most important dogmatic works *(Five Books against Eunomius,* written in 361, in defence of the deity of Christ, and his work *On the Holy Spirit,* written in 375, to Amphilochius, at his request) were republished, edited by Goldhorn, in the second volume of Thilo's *Bibliotheca Patrum Græcorum Dogmatica.* Leipsic, 1854.

[3] In his *Church History,* vol. 3, p. 902.

the frightful persecutions inflicted by Valens, the Arian.

4) GREGORY OF NYSSA[1] (d. about 395), the youngest of the three Cappadocians and the brother of Basil the Great, was the profoundest theologian of the three, and excelled his two friends in philosophic acumen and scientific attainments. SCHAFF:[2] "Gregory did lasting service in the vindication of the mystery of the Trinity and the Incarnation, and in the accurate distinction between essence and hypostasis. Of all the church teachers of the Nicene age he is the nearest to Origen. He not only follows his sometimes utterly extravagant allegorical method of interpretation, but even to a great extent falls in with his dogmatic views. With him, as with Origen, human freedom plays a great part. Both are idealistic, and sometimes, without intending it or knowing it, fall into contradiction with the Church doctrine, especially in eschatology. Gregory adopts, for example, the doctrine of the final restoration of all things."

UEBERWEG[3]: "In his scientific method Gregory follows Origen; but he adopted the doctrine of the latter, only in so far as it agreed with the orthodox dogmas. He combats expressly such theories as the pre-existence of the soul before the body, and deviates from the approved faith of the Church only in his leaning toward the theory of a final restoration of all things to communion with God."

[1] A selection of his most important writings, in the original Greek, together with a German translation, has been published by FRANZ OEHLER in his *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*, vols. 1—4. Leipsic, 1858—59. An English translation of his select writings and letters has been published by the Christian Literature Co., New York, 1893.

[2] *Church History*, vol. 3, p. 907—8.

[3] See his *History of Philosophy*, vol. 1, p. 326. (A work which cannot be too highly recommended.)

5) DIDYMUS called "the Blind" (d. 395), though he lost his sight at the age of four, by his extraordinary industry acquired an extensive learning. He became so familiar with the Holy Scriptures by hearing them read, that he knew them almost by heart. Athanasius appointed him as a teacher in the catechetical school of Alexandria where he labored successfully for more than fifty years. Jerome, Rufinus, Isidore, Evagrius, and others were among his pupils. Though he was orthodox in the doctrine of the Trinity, and a zealous opponent of Arianism, still being an enthusiastic admirer of Origen, he shared some of the extravagant views of that Father, especially concerning the pre-existence of souls and probably concerning final restoration.

Of his many works only a few have been preserved.

Of his dogmatic writings, we possess, however, a Latin translation by Jerome of his treatise "On the Holy Ghost," and three books "On the Trinity," in the Greek original, together with a brief treatise against the Manichæans, also in the original Greek.

6) CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA (d. 444) furnishes a striking proof that orthodoxy and piety are two quite different things, and that zeal for pure doctrine may coexist with an unchristian spirit (SCHAFF). And still with all his personal faults, Cyril must be reckoned among the greatest dogmaticians of the Greek Church. His Christological writings against Nestorius and Theodoret are of the greatest importance to the history of doctrine. Among his writings we may mention his "Five Books against Nestorius," and a doctrinal work "On the Trinity and the Incarnation."

7) CYRIL OF JERUSALEM (d. 386) took an active part in the Arian controversy, and at the second oecumenical council held at Constantinople, 381, he received the

praise for having suffered much from the Arians for the faith. He left us an important theological work[1], the first example of a popular compend of religion, which is of great value for the study of the history of doctrine, and for the true understanding of the liturgy and catechetical methods of the Early Church.

3. *The last Theologian of the Greek Church.*

1) JOHN OF DAMASCUS[2] (d. 754) is the last of the Greek Fathers, and the most authoritative theologian in the Eastern Church. In his famous work *"The Fount of Knowledge,"* he gives us an epitome of the theology of the Greek Church. This work consists of three separate books. In the first book, called "Heads of Philosophy," in a series of short chapters, we have an application of the Categories of Aristotle to theology,—a work which is valuable mainly on account of the light it throws upon the terminology of the Church of that period. In the second part, "On Heresies," we have a description of one hundred and three heresies, compiled mostly from Epiphanius. The third part is the most important of all—"An accurate Exposition of the most Orthodox Faith." In this part he systematically arranges and presents the various doctrines or dogmas as propounded by the Councils and the Church Fathers, especially as presented by the three great Cappadocians. This last part, as we now have it, is divided into four books: I. Theology proper. (Here John of

[1] His 23 *Catecheses*, or catechetical lectures, which he delivered while still a presbyter, about the year 347, in preparing a class of catechumens for baptism. We have this work complete in the Greek original, and it has been translated into German and English. See vol. 7 of the Second Series of *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.* New York, 1894.

[2] See Langen: *Johannes von Damaskus.* Pp. VIII, 311. Gotha, 1879; also Lupton: *St. John of Damascus.* London, 1882.

Damascus maintains the Greek Church doctrine of the single procession of the Holy Spirit.) II. Creation, Anthropology, Providence, Predestination. III. Incarnation. IV. Person of Christ, States of Christ, Faith, Baptism, the Eucharist, Images, the Scriptures, Virginity, Circumcision, Antichrist, Resurrection, etc.

John of Damascus has been called the "Father of Scholasticism" and "the Lombard of the Greeks," and in a certain sense he was the forerunner of the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages.

3. THE WESTERN CHURCH.

The Theologians of the Western Church were distinguished by their firm adherence to the Bible, their strong faith, their practical tendency in contradistinction to the speculations of the Alexandrian School, and for their bold stand against Gnosticism and all kinds of heresies.

1. *To the Death of Augustine.*

Among the most influential of the Western Church Fathers of this period, whose writings are mainly of a dogmatic character, we may mention IRENÆUS, TERTULLIAN, CYPRIAN, HILARY, AMBROSE, and AUGUSTINE.

1) IRENÆUS[1] (d. 202) spent his youth in Asia Minor, was instructed by the venerable Polycarp of Smyrna, the pupil of St. John. After 178 he was bishop of Lyons in France.

SCHAFF[2]: "Irenæus is the leading representative of Catholic Christianity in the last quarter of the second century, the champion of orthodoxy against gnostic

[1] Best edition of his works by HARVEY in 2 vols. Cambridge, 1857. English translation in Coxe's edition of *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Compare also Beaven: *Life and Writings of Irenæus*. London, 1841; Duncker: *Des heil. Irenæus Christologie*. Goettingen, 1843.

[2] See his *Church History*, vol. 2, pp. 750, 587.

heresy, and the mediator between the Eastern and Western Churches. He is the first of all the church teachers to give a careful analysis of the work of redemption, and his view is by far the deepest and soundest we find in the first three centuries. On the whole, he is the most orthodox of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. We must, however, except his Eschatology."

It was during the early years of his episcopate at Lyons that Irenæus wrote, in Greek, his important work *"Against Heresies,"* in five books. The full title is "A Refutation and Subversion of Knowledge falsely so called," and "is at once the polemic theological masterpiece of the Ante-Nicene age, and the richest mine of information respecting Gnosticism and the Church doctrine of that age."

2) TERTULLIAN[1] (d. 220) is the father of the Latin ecclesiastical language, and one of the greatest of the Christian Fathers. As a heathen, he distinguished himself as an advocate and rhetorician. He was converted when he was about forty years of age. His zeal in favor of strict asceticism and against every kind of wordliness led him to become a Montanist, about 201, when about fifty years of age. In developing his Christian theology, he was influenced by the judicial habit of mind resulting from his previous legal studies, while,

[1] Best edition of his works by OEHLER in three vols., 1853—54. For students we would especially recommend March: *Select Works of Tertullian.* New York, 1876. (Contains *Ad Martyres. De testimonio animæ, Apologeticus, Ad Scapulam,* and *De spectaculis.*) English Translation in Coxe's edition of *Ante-Nicene Fathers,* vol. 3, pp. 745, and vol. 4, pp. 1—126. For *Monographs* see Neander: *Antignosticus. Geist des Tertullianus und Einleitung in dessen Schriften.* Second edition, Berlin, 1849. Translated into English by RYLAND in 2 vols. London, 1859. Kaye: *Ecclesiastical History of Second and Third Centuries, Illustrated from the writings of Tertullian.* Third edition, London, 1845. Hauck: *Tertullians Leben und Schriften.* Pp. 410. Erlangen, 1877.

in defending it, he employed that peculiar eloquence which had characterized him as an advocate.

KURTZ: "Although trained in heathen lore, Tertullian was fanatically opposed to it, and equally so to Gnosticism. His peculiar mode of thinking and feeling, the energy of his will, the ardor of his affections, his powerful imagination, his tendency toward the strictest asceticism, and his predilection for realism, found full scope for development in Montanism. If, withal, he kept free from many aberrations of Montanism, this must be ascribed to his clear understanding and, however much he may have despised it, to his thorough scientific training."

SCHAFF: "Tertullian's theology revolves about the great Pauline antithesis of sin and grace, and breaks the road to the Latin anthropology and soteriology, afterward developed by his like-minded, but clearer, calmer, and more considerate countryman, Augustine."

The writings of Tertullian (as classified by Neander) are 1) partly apologetic, addressed to the heathens, and relating to the conduct of the Christians under persecution; 2) partly ethical or ascetic, and 3) partly dogmatic and polemical. They can also at the same time be arranged chronologically, i. e., some books were written before he became a Montanist (before 200—201 A. D.), some after this period.

We, here, have only to do with the third class of writings. The principal dogmatic or polemical Ante-Montanistic work is the well-known treatise *"On the Prescription of Heretics."* In it Tertullian lays down the fundamental principle of the Church in dealing with heretics.

Of the Montanistic writings of a dogmatic character we may especially mention his *"Five Books against*

Marcion," in which he elaborately defends the unity of God, the integrity of the Scriptures, and the harmony of the Old and the New Testaments. His tracts *"On the Flesh of Christ," "On the Soul," "On the Resurrection of the Flesh," "Against Hermogenes," "Against Praxeas,"* are important to the history of Christian doctrine.

Cardinal Newman calls Tertullian "the most powerful writer of the early centuries."

3) CYPRIAN[1] (d. 258), at first a heathen rhetorician, afterwards bishop of Carthage (248—258), was equally distinguished by a firm adherence to the idea of one, holy, visible Church, and by zeal, faithfulness, vigor, and prudence in the administration of his duties.

SCHAFF: "As Origen was the ablest scholar, and Tertullian the strongest writer, so Cyprian was the greatest bishop of the third century... His peculiar importance falls not so much in the field of theology, where he lacks originality and depth, as in Church organization and discipline... He is the typical high churchman of the Ante-Nicene Age... He knew how to combine strictness and moderation, dignity and gentleness, and to inspire love and confidence, as well as esteem and veneration."

The most important works of Cyprian relate to practical questions on church government and discipline, such as *"The Unity of the Church," "On the Lapsed," "On Works and Alms,"* etc.

[1] Best critical edition of his works by HARTEL in 3 vols. Vienna, 1868—71. A convenient manual edition by GOLDHORN is found in vols. 2 and 3 (VIII, 256; VIII, 279) of GERSDORF'S *Bibliotheca Patrum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum selecta.* Leipsic, 1838—39. English translation by WALLIS, in Coxe's edition of the *Ante-Nicene Fathers,* vol. 5, pp. 261—596. Compare also POOLE: *Life and Times of Cyprian,* pp. 419. Oxford, 1840. BENSON: In *Smith and Wace Dict.,* vol. 1, pp. 739—55; RETTBERG: *Cyprianus dargestellt nach seinem Leben und Wirken* (XII, 399). Göttingen, 1831.

4) HILARY OF POITIERS[1] (d. 368), so named from his birthplace and subsequent bishopric in southwestern France, was the Athanasius of the West.

SEMISCH[2]: "He shone like a clear star alongisde of the great champions of the Nicene Creed,—Athanasius, Basil, and the two Gregories. Among the teachers of the West of his day he was beyond dispute the first, and bore a strong resemblance to Tertullian, both in disposition and scientific method... His distinguishing characteristics were fidelity to the Church creed, acuteness in argument, and resolution in action. His power lay essentially in his thorough acquaintance with the Scriptures. His Christology is full of fresh and inspiring thoughts, and deserves to be better known than it is."

His writings are distinguished for deep and earnest discussions of dogmatic theology, and he greatly contributed to the settlement of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity and the Person of Christ.

The great work of his life was the writing, in exile (356—361), of his *"Twelve Books on the Trinity,"* to which he afterwards added various tracts against Arianism.

5) AMBROSE (d. at Milan, 397) is famous as a great ecclesiastical leader, and is reckoned as one of the great Latin Fathers. He took a prominent part in the Arian controversy, and was one of the leaders on the orthodox side. As a writer, Ambrose is distinguished for his sermons, and his moral, ascetic, and dogmatic works. His dogmatic treatises, *De Mysteriis, De Fide,* and *De Spiritu Sancto,* are based upon the writings of Basil.

[1] Compare BALTZER: *Die Theologie des heil. Hilarius von Poitiers.* Pp. 511. Rottweil, 1879. An English translation may appear in *Second* series of Schaff's edition in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.*

[2] In *Schaff-Herzog.*

His ascetic views have often been misunderstood. In the Doctrine of God and in Christology his dogmatic position is that of the Council of Nice; in Anthropology he emphasizes the universal sinfulness of man; and in Soteriology lays stress upon divine grace as the only source of salvation. He belongs, however, to the allegorical and mystical school of interpreters, and in this he goes further than even Origen.

6) AUGUSTINE[1] (d. 430), for thirty-five years bishop of Hippo, a town lying 200 miles west of Carthage, was the intellectual head of the North African and the entire Western Church of his time.

SCHAFF[2]: "Augustine is a philosophical and theological genius of the first order, towering like a pyramid above his age, and looking down commandingly upon succeeding ages... As a theologian he is *facile princeps*, at least surpassed by no church father, scholastic, or reformer... He combined the creative power of Tertullian with the churchly spirit of Cyprian, the speculative intellect of the Greek Church with the practical tact of the Latin. He was a Christian philosopher and a philosophical theologian to the full... With profundity he combined an equal clearness and sharpness of thought. He was an extremely skilful and a suc-

[1] For an English translation of the works of Augustine see Schaff's edition of *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First Series*, volumes 1—8. This is by far the most valuable edition of Augustine's works ever published, on account of its valuable Introductions and Bibliographical notes. See especially BINDEMANN: *Der heil. Augustinus*, 3 vols. (Vol. I, Berlin, 1844; II, Leipsic, 1855; III, Greifswald, 1869). ("The best work in German.") See also CUTTS: *St. Augustin*, London, 1880; SCHAFF in his *St. Augustin, Melanchthon and Neander*, New York, 1886.

On the *theology* of Augustine see AUG. DORNER: *Augustinus, sein theol. System, etc.*, Berlin, 1873; and the same writer's article in Plitt-Herzog (abridged in Schaff-Herzog). UEBERWEG'S criticism of the Philosophy of Augustine, in his *History of Philosophy* (Vol. I, pp. 333—346) is very suggestive.

[2] In his *Church History*, Vol. 3, pp. 994—999.

cessful dialectician, inexhaustible in arguments and in answers to the objections of his adversaries... In him was concentrated the whole polemic power of the Catholicism of the time against heresy and schism, and in him it won the victory over them."

BINDEMANN[1]: "St. Augustine is one of the greatest personages in the Church. He is second in importance to none of the teachers who have wrought most in the Church since the Apostolic time; and it can well be said that among the Church Fathers the first place is due to him, and in the time of the Reformation a Luther alone, for fulness and depth of thought and grandeur of character, may stand by his side. He is the summit of the mediæval Western Church; from him descended the mysticism, no less than the scholasticism, of the Middle Ages; he was one of the strongest pillars of Roman Catholicism, and from his works, next to the Holy Scriptures, especially the Epistles of Paul, the leaders of the Reformation drew most of that conviction by which a new age was introduced."

His writings bear upon almost all the departments of theology, and may be characterized as forming an era in theological literature. Of the different works of Augustine (1) Autobiographical, 2) Philosophical, 3) Apologetic, 4) Religious-Theological, 5) Polemic-Theological, 6) Exegetical, and 7) Ethical and Practical) we here have to do mainly with the fourth and fifth classes. Of his Religious-Theological works we would especially mention *"Four Books on Crhistian Doctrine"* (the best patristic work on Biblical Hermeneutics), and *"The Enchiridion"*[2] or "On Faith, Hope, and Love"

[1] In the preface of his monograph on St. Augustine, already cited (quoted by SCHAFF).

[2] Under the topic *Faith* he follows the order of the Apostles' Creed and refutes, without naming them, Manichæan, Apollinarian, Arian, and Pelagian heresies. Under *Hope* he explains *The Lord's Prayer.*

(a brief compend of Christian faith and morals, written at the request of a certain Laurentius).

But his Polemico-Theological works are the most important in the history of doctrine. These again may be subdivided (1) Anti-Manichæan, 2) Anti-Donatistic, 3) Anti-Arian, 4) Anti-Pelagian). In the Anti-Manichæan writings[1], Augustine treats of the origin of evil, of free will, of revelation and nature, of the authority of the Scriptures and the Church, etc.

The Anti-Donatistic works[2] contain Augustine's doctrine of the Church, the Sacraments, and of Church-discipline.

Of the Anti-Arian writings, which treat of the Deity of Christ, and of the Holy Ghost, the most important treatise is that on the *"Holy Trinity,"* in fifteen books.

"It is the most elaborate, and probably also the ablest and profoundest patristic discussion of this central doctrine of the Christian religion, unless we except the "Orations against the Arians" by Athanasius, "The Father of Orthodoxy," who devoted his life to the defense of the Divinity of Christ. Augustine bestowed more time and care upon it than on any other book, except "the City of God."[3] But the most valuable of all the writings of Augustine were his Anti-Pelagian works.[4] All these were written after 412, and in them

[1] A translation of the more important of these *(On the Morals of the Catholic Church, On the Morals of the Manichæans, On two Souls, Thirty-three books against Faustus the Manichæan, On the Nature of the Good, etc.)* is given in Vol. 4 (pp. 1—365) of Schaff's *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (First Series).

[2] Three of the most important treatises *(On Baptism, Answers to the Letters of Petilian, The Correction of the Donatists)* are given in Vol. 4 (pp. 367—675) of the work in the last note.

[3] See Preface of Vol. 3 of Schaff's *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (First Series) which, among other important doctrinal treatises of Augustine, contains the translation of this work, *"On the Holy Trinity* (pp. 1—228).

[4] The most important of these ("On the Spirit and the Letter" (413 A. D.), "On Nature and Grace" (415), "On Grace and Free

he develops his system of anthropology and soteriology, and most nearly approaches the position of Evangelical Protestantism.

We cannot leave Augustine without referring to his great Apologetic work, *"The City of God,"* in twenty-two books, the only Christian philosophy of history known for over a thousand years. "It is the masterpiece of the greatest genius among the Latin Fathers, and the best known and read of his works, except the 'Confessions.' It embodies the results of thirteen years of intellectual labor and study (413—426 A. D.). It is a vindication of Christianity against the attacks of the heathen in view of the sacking of the city of Rome by the barbarians... It is the first attempt of a philosophy of history, under the aspect of two rival cities or communities, the eternal city of God and the perishing city of the world."[1]

The formal principle of the doctrinal system of Augustine is the Authority of the Church, the material principle, the free redeeming Grace of God in Christ.

2. *To the Close of the Ninth Century.*

1) VINCENT OF LERINS[2] (d. 450), a monk in the celebrated monastery of Lerinum (a small island in the Mediterranean Sea, formerly belonging to Roman Gaul), in his famous book *Commonitorium* gives us the most complete representation of the Roman Catholic doctrine of tradition. As a test of true doctrine he propounded the maxim, which has since remained

Will (426), "On Discipline and Grace" (427), "On the Predestination of the Saints" (428), "On the Gift of Perseverance" (429), etc.) are given in Vol. 5 of Schaff's *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (First Series), pp. LXXI, 567.

[1] See Preface to Vol. 2 of *Series* just cited.

[2] For a full analysis of his "Commonitorium" see Schmidt in first edition of Herzog's *Real Encykl.*

the standard in the Roman Catholic Church: "We must hold what has been *everywhere, always,* and *by all* believed."[1] This work also occupies a prominent place in the history of doctrines, for its Semi-Pelagian character and its antagonism to Augustine are clearly discernible.

2) GENNADIUS OF MARSEILLES (flourished 500 A. D.), a Semi-Pelagian presbyter of South Gaul, in his "De Fide mea sive dogmatibus ecclesiasticis" gives us a compend of Christian doctrine.

3) ISIDORE (d. 636), bishop of Seville, in Spain, for thirty-six years, was the greatest scholar of his day. He wrote on nearly every branch of science then known. His most important theological work is a Compend of Theology compiled from Augustine and the *"Moralia"* of Gregory the Great, known under the title of "Sententiarum sive de Summo Bono Libri III." The first book treats of Dogmatics and the last two of Ethics. The influence of this work during the Middle Ages was very great, and innumerable copies were made of it, and it led to the preparation of similar works, like Peter Lombard's *"Sentences."*

4) JOHN SCOTUS ERIGENA[2] (d. about 877) was of Scottish nationality, probably born and brought up in Ireland, but he spent his later life at the court of Charles the Bald of France. He was undoubtedly the most independent thinker of his time. His speculations have not been surpassed for centuries before or after him. In his own time he was neither understood nor appreciated, and scarcely deemed even worthy of being declared a heretic (KURTZ).

[1] "Ut id teneamus quod *ubique*, quod *semper*, quod *ab omnibus* creditum est."

[2] Compare Th. Christlieb: *Leben und Lehre des Joh. Scotus Erigena*, Gotha, 1860; Ueberweg: *History of Philosophy*, Vol. 1, pp. 358—365.

His greatest work is his treatise *"De Divisione Naturae"*[1] in five books, condemned to be burned by Pope Honorius III. (1225) as "a book teeming with the worms of heretical depravity," and still later put on the "Index" by a bull of Gregory XIII. (1685). This is a kind of speculative theology, which, starting from the supposition of the unity of philosophy and theology, ends as a system of idealistic pantheism, philosophy having in the course of the development entirely absorbed theology.

Scotus divides *nature,* in which conception he includes all that is either existent or non-existent—into four species: 1) that which creates and is not created (God), 2) that which is created and creates (Logos), 3) that which is created and does not create (World), and 4) that which neither is created nor creates. By this last is not meant a fourth nature, distinct from the other three, but God, viewed as the term in which all things end, and to which all finally return.

In the controversy respecting predestination he taught that there was only one predestination, to eternal salvation.

Scotus Erigena, sometimes, has been called "the Father of Scholasticism," but he is rather the founder of Speculative Philosophy in the line of Spinoza, Schelling, and especially Hegel. "The scholastics drew from him, but he was not a scholastic. The mystics drew from him, but he was not a mystic... He is one of the most interesting figures among the mediæval writers. He demands study and he rewards it."[2]

5) BOETHIUS[3] (beheaded at Pavia 525), one of the

[1] German translation by L. NOACK: *Erigena ueber die Eintheilung der Natur.* 3 pts. Leipsic, 1874—7.

[2] See Schaff's *Church History,* Vol. 4, p. 773.

[3] See Fr. Nitzch: *Das System des Boëthius und die ihm zugeschriebenen theol. Schriften.* Berlin, 1860.

last Neo-Platonists of antiquity, through his *"Consolation of Philosophy,"* as also through his translation and exposition of some of the logical writings of Aristotle, became the most influential connecting link between ancient and mediæval learning. His "Consolatio" was very popular during the Middle Ages, and was translated into various languages (Greek, Old High German, Anglo-Saxon, Norman-English, French, Hebrew), but it is a question whether Boëthius was a Christian. The work is but an echo of Greek philosophy, of the school of Plato or Seneca.

§ 16. The Dogmatics of the Middle Ages.

The Dogmatics of the Middle Ages was influenced by Scholasticism and by the antithesis of Realism and Nominalism.

1. *The Essential Character of Scholasticism.*[1]

Scholasticism was the reproduction of ancient philosophy under the control of ecclesiastical doctrine. In matters common to philosophy and theology, the latter was received as the absolute norm and criterion of truth. Its *fides praecedit intellectum* was uttered in the interest of the doctrines of a Church which claimed to be infallible.

The Scholastics did not add new dogmas, nor alter them with respect to their essential contents. Having the materials for the formation of a doctrinal system of Christianity in the dogmas as formulated and fixed by the œcumenical councils of the Church, it was their task to gather these materials, sift, arrange, preserve,

[1] Compare Thomasius: *Dogmengeschichte*, Vol. 2, pp. 31—66; Ueberweg: *History of Philosophy*, Vol. 1, 355—484; Hampden: *The Scholastic Philosophy considered in its relation to Christian Philosophy*. 3rd edition. London, 1838.

and apply them. But is was also a *treatment* of these dogmas. They sought to give to each doctrine a rational foundation, sufficient to elevate it from a mere matter of faith to a matter of science. They hoped to form the whole mass of dogmas into a perfect system. Some, indeed, hoped to create a philosophy of Christianity, and to bring about a perfect unity between faith and science, theology and philosophy. They proceeded from the supposition that the whole contents of the Christian faith, i. e., each single dogma or doctrine is absolute, divine truth,—but the warrant for this supposition was not sought for *in Scripture*, nor in the *essence of Christianity*, nor in the nature of man (a favorite theory of so many modern philosophers), but in the authority of the Church and her tradition.

With all the censure heaped in after times upon the barrenness of Scholastic speculation, it was wonderfully acute, and it has rich results to invite the scholar to a thorough acquaintance with it.

The period of its highest bloom and most complete development was characterized by the thorough mastery of Aristotle and the ascendency of his authority in matters of philosophy. Aristotle came to be called *"præcursor Christi in naturalibus,"* just as John the Baptist was called *"præcursor Christi in gratuitis."*

The antithesis of Realism and Nominalism influenced the whole history of the theology of the Middle Ages.

Extreme *Realism*, the doctrine of Plato, maintained that universals or general ideas have an independent existence apart from individual objects, and that they exist before the latter *(universalia ante rem*, in God's mind); moderate Realism, the doctrine of Aristotle, maintained that universals, while possessing indeed a real existence, exist only *in* individual objects *(uni-*

versalia in re, in things), and this view was the bond between theology and philosophy; Nominalism, on the other hand, maintained that only individuals have real existence, and that universals are merely the products of the human reason, nothing but a concept of man's mind *(universalia post rem,* in man's thoughts), and this last view separated the bond between theology and philosophy, and led to scepticism in spiritual matters.

Of the earlier period, Augustine and Boëthius were decided Realists; so also John Scotus Erigena of the ninth century. The great Realists of the eleventh and twelfth centuries were Anselm, William of Champeaux and Bernard of Clairvaux; of the thirteenth, Alexander of Hales, Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus. The chief Nominalists were Roscellinus and William of Occam. Abelard was a moderate Nominalist or Conceptualist.

2. *The Beginnings of Scholasticism.*

1) ANSELM OF CANTERBURY[1] (d. 1109), the father of orthodox scholasticism, the Augustine of the Middle Ages, was Archbishop of Canterbury from 1093 to his death. He regarded faith as the necessary condition of all true knowledge, and defined the object of scholastic theology to be the logical development and demonstration of the doctrines of the Church such as they were handed down by the Fathers. By his *"Credo, ut intelligam,"* he means that Christians should advance from direct faith to whatever degree of scientific insight may be attainable by them, but always on the condition that the Christian Creed, already fixed in dogmatic form, remain untouched and be regarded as

[1] See Hasse: *Anselm von Canterbury.* 2 vols. Leipsic, 1843—52. An abridged English translation by TURNER, London, 1850. See also CHURCH: *Life of St. Anselm.* London, 1875.

the absolute norm for thought. Anselm requires, therefore, unconditional submission to the authority of the Church.

As a metaphysician he was a Realist, and one of his earliest works *(De Fide Trinitatis)* was written against the Nominalism of Roscellinus. The fame of Anselm chiefly rests on his two celebrated works, *"Proslogium"* and *"Cur Deus homo?"*[1] In the first he sets forth the ontological proof of the existence of God, as following from the very idea which we have of him, existence forming one of the necessary attributes of God. In the last Anselm treats of the doctrine of redemption and satisfaction, and develops the theory of vicarious atonement, which was afterwards adopted by the Church.

It is a characteristic of Anselm that he sought to establish on rational grounds not only the existence of God, but also the doctrines of the Trinity and of Incarnation.

2) ROSCELLINUS has often been named as the founder of Nominalism. He attracted special attention to the dangerous tendency of Nominalism by applying his philosophical views to the doctrine of the Trinity, maintaining that our conception of the Deity was only an intellectual abstraction, and that the three persons of the Godhead could not be spoken of as One, and consequently the Trinity became to him three Gods. In the year 1092 the Council of Soissons compelled him to recant his tritheistic exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity, and he soon disappears from history.

3) WILLIAM OF CHAMPEAUX (d. 1122), an intimate friend of Bernard of Clairvaux, was the special champion of Realism in France, but was defeated by Abe-

[1] In two books, and frequently published separately (Erlangen, 1834; Berlin, 1857; London, 1863). Also to be had in English.

lard. In his *"De Origine Animæ"* he pronounced himself in favor of *Creationism*, and from his *"De Eucharistia"* it is evident that in his time the Lord's Supper was still generally administered "in both kinds."

4) ABELARD (d. 1142) adopted a position of his own between the Nominalism of Roscellinus and the Realism of Anselm, but his doctrine did not differ much from strict Nominalism. In theology as well as in philosophy, he is merely a critic. Through him was prepared in the Middle Ages the ascendency of the philosophical authority of Aristotle, which became firmly established within a half century of his death. In comparison with the rigid orthodoxy of Anselm, Abelard shows a strong rationalistic tendency, and his dialectics drove him on almost every point beyond the pale of the faith of the Church, yet it is to him as much as to Anselm that the theology of the Middle Ages owes its dialectical form. In his *"Introductio ad theologiam"* he lays down the principle (in opposition to Anselm's *Credo, ut intelligam)* that *rational insight* must prepare the way for faith, since without it, faith is not sure of its truth *(nihil credi posse, nisi prius intellectum; intelligo, ut credam)*.

Although Abelard decidedly rejected the Tritheism of Roscellinus, still in his doctrine of the Trinity he verges towards Monarchianism (explaining the three persons as being God's power, wisdom, and goodness, *potentia, sapientia et benignitas)*, though he did not confess this consequence.

In his bold work *"Sic et Non,"*—which consists of quotations from the Fathers arranged in harmony with the *Loci theologici*, but contradicting each other at every point without any solution being offered—he seeks to maintain his independence of patristic au-

thority. This work establishes the fact, that only what is contained in the canonical Scriptures is without exception and unconditionally true and that no one of the Church Fathers may be regarded as of equal authority with the Apostles.

The most brilliant period of Abelard's life was about twenty-five years before his death. His fame as a teacher was then at its height, and thousands of pupils gathered around him in Paris. Nearly all the great men of the age, both within and without the Church, heard Abelard. But this brilliant career was suddenly checked by his relation to Heloise.

About 1135, seven years before his death, his conflict with his great opponent, Bernard of Clairvaux, begins. Bernard complained of the rationalistic tendency of Abelard and affirmed that he "savored of Arius when he spoke of the Trinity," "of Pelagius when he spoke of grace," "of Nestorius when he spoke of the person of Christ," and that "while he labored to prove Plato a Christian, he showed himself a heathen."

5) BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX[1] (d. 1153), the great opponent of Abelard, was one of the most illustrious Christian teachers and representatives of monasticism in the Middle Ages. He founded the famous monastery of Clairvaux, and at his death left behind him one hundred and sixty monasteries, which had been formed by monks from Clairvaux. He is the "last of the Fathers," representing what is called the positive, patristic school. In his writings Bernard exhibits a decided antagonism to the speculations of his day, and

[1] See Lives by Neander, Morrison, and Storrs. Of special interest is Eales: *Life and Works of St. Bernard.* 2 vols. London, 1889. The first two volumes contain 380 letters written by St. Bernard between the years 1119 and 1149.

a deep love for contemplative, or rather mystical, theology.[1]

ROBERTSON:[2] "Bernard found himself, apparently without design, and even unconsciously, elevated to a position of such influence as no ecclesiastic, either before or since his time, has attained. Declining the ecclesiastical dignities to which he saw a multitude of his followers promoted, the Abbot of Clairvaux was for a quarter of a century the real soul and director of the Papacy; he guided the policy of Emperors and Kings, and swayed the deliberations of councils; nay, however little his character and the training of his own mind might have fitted him for such a work, the authority of his sanctity was such as even to control the intellectual development of the age which owned him as its master."

6) The VICTORINES—Hugo, Richard, and Walter,—so called from the abbey of St. Victor at Paris, adhered closely to the dogmas of the Church, which they endeavored to explain and support. All of them combined the cultivation of the dialectics of the age with a more spiritual and mystical turn of mind.

a) HUGO OF ST. VICTOR[3] (d. 1141) was one of the profoundest thinkers of the Middle Ages, and a man of great learning. He is the real founder of the mediæval mysticism of France. His theological views are unfolded in his *"Summa Sententiarum,"* and more fully in his treatise *"De Sacramentis Fidei Christianæ,"* which was written against Abelard. The spirit of his teaching can be seen from the two main propositions on which this last work is based:

[1] His *Sermons on Canticles* have been translated into German (with a preface by Franz Delitzsch). Leipsic, 1862.
[2] In his *Church History*, Vol. 3, pp. 11, 12.
[3] See Liebner: *Hugo von St. Victor, etc.* Leipsic, 1832. (The most comprehensive monograph.)

1) *tantum de veritate quisque potest videre quantum ipse est*—what a man is in himself is the measure of his insight of the truth, and 2) we can only know God by loving him (ubi caritas est, claritas est). He also laid down the principle that the "uncorrupted truth of things cannot be discovered by reasoning."

b) RICHARD OF ST. VICTOR[1] (d. 1173) is still more pronounced in his mystical tendency. His works are concerned chiefly with inward and contemplative religion. His great motto was: "You have just as much power as you have grace." The most celebrated of his mystical works is his *"De gratia contemplationis."* He distinguishes *contemplatio* from *cogitatio* and *meditatio*. *Cogitatio* is common thought, *meditatio* is a deep pondering on a special subject, *contemplatio* is an intuition, an immediate vision of the divine.

c) WALTER OF ST. VICTOR (d. 1180) took the boldest stand against the prevailing scholasticism of his day, and wrote a work "Against the four labyrinths of France" (Abelard, Peter Lombard, Gilbertus Porretanus, and Peter of Poitiers), affirming that all of them, "inspired with the spirit of Aristotle, had treated with scholastic levity the doctrine of the ineffable Trinity and of the Incarnation."

7) PETER LOMBARD (d. 1164), in his celebrated manual of dogmatics, *"Four Books of Sentences,"*[2] which procured for him the title of "Master of Sentences," sought to justify the doctrines of the Church by subtle processes of reasoning, and refinement of argument. His main authority is Augustine, and he arranged his matter systematically. As the whole was neatly and

[1] Compare Kaulich: *Die Lehre des Hugo und Richard von St. Victor.* Prague, 1864.

[2] In the *first book* he treats of God; in the *second*, of created things; in the *third*, of the incarnation, redemption, etc.; in the *fourth*, of eschatology and the (seven) sacraments.

methodically put together, it was welcomed as a clear and useful handbook, and the work became and for centuries continued in the schools to be the basis of the theological instruction. It was imitated by some, and commented upon by others. In the dialectical treatment of theological questions the "Sentences" were, as a rule, made a point of departure.

3. *The Period of the highest bloom of Scholasticism.*

1) ALEXANDER OF HALES (d. 1245), "the monarch of theologians," "the Irrefragable Doctor," was the first Scholastic who used the whole philosophy of Aristotle in the service of Christian theology, and in his great work *"Summa Universæ Theologiæ"*[1] he made use of philosophy for the demonstration of theological dogmas. He quotes a triple series of authorities, 1) those who say yes, 2) those who say no, and 3) the reconciling views,—choosing the authorities not only in the Bible and among the Fathers, but among the later philosophers and theologians as well as Greek, Latin, and Arabian poets.

2) ALBERTUS MAGNUS[2] (d. 1280), called "the Universal Doctor" on account of his extensive learning and great skill in instruction, was the first Scholastic who introduced the complete system of Aristotle to the understanding of his age through loose reproductions from the Arabic, and this furnished the scholastic philosophy with means for its highest development. In his *"Summa Theologiæ,"* while searching constantly for philosophical arguments in support of the articles of faith, Albertus nevertheless excludes the specifically

[1] 1. Of God and his attributes; 2. Of creation and sin; 3. Of redemption and atonement; 4. The Sacraments.

[2] See Sighart: *Albertus Magnus, sein Leben and seine Wissenschaft.* Regensburg, 1857.

biblical and Christian doctrines of revelation from the sphere of things knowable by the light of reason.

3) THOMAS AQUINAS[1] (d. 1274), "the Angelic Doctor," was the profoundest and keenest defender of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, and has a place with Augustine, Jerome, and Ambrose, among the four authoritative teachers of the Church. In an encyclical dated August 4, 1879, Pope Leo XIII recommended his works to the Catholic seminaries and theological faculties throughout the world, as a proper foundation of their religious and philosophical teaching.

Taking his stand as a Realist, he brought the Scholastic philosophy to its highest stage of development, by effecting the most perfect accommodation that was possible of the Aristotelian philosophy to ecclesiastical orthodoxy, and was careful to distinguish between those truths which are only known by revelation and those which could be known and demonstrated by reason. His exegetical principles are good, and he refers more frequently to biblical texts than the other scholastics, but he could not free himself from ecclesiastical authority.

The principal works of Aquinas on theology are his *"Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard,"* a work of his earlier years, in which he worked out his own system, and his great (unfinished) work *"Summa totius Theologiæ,"*[2] the work of his later years, in which

[1] See Werner: *Der heil. Thomas von Aquino.* 3 vols. (Vol. I, Life and writings; Vol. II, Doctrine; Vol. III, History of Thomism). Regensburg, 1858—59. Also Vaughan, R. C. Archbishop of Sydney: *Life and Letters of St. Thomas Aquinas.* 2 vols. London, 1871—72.

[2] This work is divided into three great parts: I. Of God and his works. II. Of Man, and the seven virtues, which he classifies as 1) theological,—faith, hope, and love; and 2) ethical,—the four cardinal virtues of justice, prudence, fortitude, and temperance. III. Christ's Person and Work, and the Sacraments,—their num-

all revealed doctrines were to be systematically presented. In this last work Aquinas maintains that the Church's doctrines of the creation of the world in time, of original sin, of the incarnation of the Logos, of the sacraments, of the resurrection of the flesh, of the judgment, and eternal salvation and damnation, are not to be demonstrated by natural reason. These revealed doctrines are regarded by Thomas as above, but not contrary to, reason.

He is not willing to accept Anselm's ontological argument for the existence of God, but himself gives several forms of the cosmological and teleological arguments, — nevertheless adds, that while reason can prove that God exists, it cannot discover what his nature is. He employs all his speculative talent to explain the doctrine of the Trinity, yet declares that it is beyond the sphere of reason to discover the distinction of persons in the Godhead, and affirms that he who tries to prove the doctrine of the Trinity by the unaided reason derogates from faith.[1] Under *providence* he considers the doctrines of election and reprobation. Both reprobation and election are matters of divine decree; and the exact number of the reprobate as well as of the elect, is determined in advance. His treatment of the seven sacraments, had a shaping influence upon the discussion of the subject in after-time. He also teaches the doctrines of purgatory and of the intercessions of the saints.

ber being seven,—Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penitence, Orders, Marriage, and Extreme Unction. (The author did not live to finish his great work, but died before he reached the discussion of "the sacrament of Orders." A supplement containing his views, taken from his Commentary on Peter Lombard's *Book of Sentences*, has been appended to the later editions of his *Summa*.)

[1] See LANDERER in Schaff-Herzog.

NEANDER:[1] "Aquinas is said to have employed three or four amanuenses, to all of whom he dictated at once on different subjects. His writings show that his thoughts on divine things flowed from a full heart; he was conscious of the necessary connection subsisting between thought and feeling. Every day he was accustomed to have something read to him from a work of edification; and when he was asked why he took this time from his speculative studies, he replied that he thought the act of devotion prepared him for soaring upwards to speculation. When the feelings were enkindled by devotion, the thoughts would more easily ascend to the highest matters. He never began to dictate, without first betaking himself to prayer for divine illumination. Whenever doubts confronted him in his investigations, he left off meditating, in order to seek divinie guidance in prayer."

4) BONAVENTURA (d. 1274) "the Seraphic Doctor," developed still further the mystical doctrine begun by Bernard of Clairvaux and continued by the Victorines, and gave to the teachings of Plato as transformed by the Church Fathers the preference over those of Aristotle, but all human wisdom, even that of Plato, appears to him as folly compared with mystical illumination. He distinguishes three stages of Christian perfection: 1) the observance of the law; 2) the fulfilment of the spiritual counsels of the Gospel; and 3) the enjoyment of eternal happiness in contemplation,— which last is reserved to ascetics. Bonaventura distinguished himself as a writer of mystical and practical works on Christianity and his *"Breviloquium"* is considered one of the best expositions of Christian Dogmatics which the Middle Ages produced.

[1] In his *Church History*. Vol. 4, pp. 422, 423 (Torrey's translation).

5) DUNS SCOTUS[1] (d. 1308, at the age of thirty-four), the pride of the Franciscans, called "the Subtle Doctor" on account of his keenness and subtlety, was the great opponent of Thomism, or the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas, and the founder of the Scotist school. His strength lay rather in acute, negative criticism of the teachings of others, than in any positive elaboration of his own. His skepticism, however, refers only to argumentation, and arguments he may destroy until he has no other basis for truth than the absolute will of God and the voluntary submission of man; but this basis, the truth of the divine revelation, and the authority of the Church, he never touches.[2] He seeks continually to establish a harmony between philosophy and the teaching of the Church.

The difference between Duns Scotus and Thomas Aquinas is very striking. Thomas is speculative, Scotus critical; in their ideas of God, Thomas lays stress on necessity, Scotus, on freedom. Thomas teaches the determination of the will, Scotus its indetermination. Thomas affirms the doctrine of predestination in the strict, Augustinian sense of the terms, while Scotus teaches a doctrine of Synergism near akin to Pelagianism. According to Thomas, God commands what is good, because it is good, while Scotus maintains, that the good is good, because God commands it. Creation, incarnation, the necessity of accepting the merit of Christ as atonement for our guilt, are facts depending solely on the free-will of God, unconditioned by any rational necessity. Thus the pre-eminence of the will over the reason, in God and in man, resolves itself into the omnipotence of the arbitrary will of the Deity.[3]

[1] See Werner: *Johannes Duns Scotus.* Vienna, 1881.
[2] See A. Dorner in *Schaff-Herzog.*
[3] See Ueberweg: *History of Philosophy.* Vol. 1, pp. 456, 457.

6) ROGER BACON[1] (d. 1294) by his devotion to the investigation of nature obtained the title "the wonderful Doctor," and became a forerunner of Bacon of Verulam. He preferred to study nature rather than to bury himself in scholastic subtleties. He did not succeed, however, in drawing his contemporaries away from metaphysics. He urged a wider circulation and more earnest study of the Bible, tracing nearly all the evil of his day to want of personal acquaintance with this heavenly rule of life. He recommended a revision of the Latin Vulgate, and especially urged the importance of returning to the study of the Bible in the original Greek and Hebrew. His *"Compendium Studii Theologiæ"* was probably his latest composition.

4. *The Time of the decline of Scholasticism.*

1) DURAND OF ST. POURSAIN (d. 1332) was surnamed "the most Resolute Doctor," on account of the resoluteness with which he maintained that there is no human authority above the human reason. The consequence was an open split between faith and knowledge, between theology and philosophy. He denied that theology was a science, and made its object or subject man instead of God, and declared the Scriptures to be a practical help in attaining heaven by good works. He wrote a *"Commentary"* on the "Sentences of Lombard," which Gerson recommended to his pupils as the best work on the subject. He disputed the current scholastic teaching respecting *transubstantiation*, which he declared to be unscriptural, and approximat-

[1] See Schneider: *Roger Bacon, Eine Monographie.* Augsburg, 1873. This writer not only protests against the extravagant judgments of late passed upon Bacon, but points out very clearly in what aspects Bacon appears as a mere scholastic.

ed closely to the view taught by the Reformers in the sixteenth century.[1]

2) WILLIAM OCCAM (d. 1347), called by his followers "the Invincible Doctor," renewed the doctrine of Nominalism, breaking completely with Realism, which had been the sole ruler in philosophy since the days of Anselm and the Victorines. He maintained that the harmony between reason and faith, between science and religion, always presupposed by Realism, must be an illusion. He denied that any theological doctrine could be demonstrated by pure reason. Even the existence and unity of God were, in his judgment, merely articles of faith. All knowledge which transcends the sphere of experience was relegated to the sphere of faith. Through his writings he exercised some influence in the period of the Reformation, especially on Luther,[2] in his earlier stage, because of Occam's opposition to the Pope, though in doctrine they were often quite antagonistic.

3) PETER D'AILLY (d. 1425), bishop of Cambray (1396) and from 1411 also a cardinal, known as "the Hammer of Heretics," though a Nominalist, defended the doctrine of the Church, and sought in philosophy to steer between skepticism and dogmatism, making a clear distinction between theology and philosophy. He gave precedence to the Bible rather than to Christian tradition, and protested against the infallibility of the pope, maintaining that the true representative of the Church was not the pope, but the œcumenical council. He also wrote a *"Commentary"* on the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard.

4) JOHN GERSON (d. 1429), "the most Christian Doctor," attempted to combine Mysticism with Scholas-

[1] See WAGENMANN in Schaff-Herzog.

[2] See Rettberg: *Occam und Luther* in *Stud. und Krit.*, 1839.

ticism. An adherent of Nominalism, he sought to reconcile theology with Scholastic philosophy, maintaining that truth could be learned only through revelation. He urged the study of the Bible and the Fathers. According to Gerson, neither Plato nor Aristotle is the right guide for him who is seeking his salvation. Better than all knowledge is obedience to the divine exhortation: Repent and believe the Gospel. He also protested against the infallibility of the pope, and held that œcumenical councils are the true representatives of the Church, and that they may accuse and depose popes.

5) GABRIEL BIEL (d. 1495), "the last Scholastic," whose chief merit lay in his clear and faithful presentation of the nominalistic doctrine, publishing a summary of the doctrines of Occam, exerted considerable influence on the beginnings of the Reformation. Semi-Pelagian in his teaching, he is the last noticeable representative of the ecclesiastical science of the Middle Ages.

5. *Mysticism and the Pre-Reformatory Theology.*[1]

1) MEISTER ECKHART[2] (d. 1329) the author and perfecter of the entire development of German Mysticism, has been called "the father of modern Pantheism," on account of his pantheistic speculations, maintaining that in its true existence every creature is not only a revelation of God, but a part of him, and that the true object of life is to strip off all illusions and deceptions, and return into the one great being, God. In many points the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas approaches ex-

[1] See Ullmann: *Reformers before the Reformation.* Translated into English. 2 vols. Also Vaughan: *Hours with the Mystics.* 2 vols. Third ed. London, 1880.

[2] See Martensen: *Meister Eckhart.* Hamburg, 1842. Also Lasson in Ueberweg's *History of Philosophy*, Vol. 1, pp. 467—84.

ceedingly near to that taught by Eckhart. The Roman Thomas became the highest scientific authority of the Romish Church, while the doctrine of Eckhart, the German, prepared the way through its ethics for the Reformation, and through its metaphysics for the later German speculation.

2) JOHANNES TAULER[1] (d. 1361), "the Sublime and Illuminated Doctor," was one of the greatest preachers of his time. He was distinguished by deep humility, ardent love, and fervent piety. On the doctrine of justification by faith he closely approximated the teaching of the Reformers. His style and doctrine entitle him to a place among the best German prose authors before Luther.

3) HEINRICH SUSO (d. 1365) was the representative of the poetical mysticism of the Middle Ages, and he wrote his book *"Von der ewigen Weisheit"*—"On Eternal Wisdom" in 1338.

4) JOHN RUYSBROECK (d. 1381), "the ecstatic Doctor," so called because he laid so much stress on the ecstatic state, was the most prominent of the Dutch mystics. Without going very deeply into ontological speculations, he taught that the way to God was through contemplation, but his views are not always free from pantheistic tendencies.

5) The unknown author of *"Theologia Germanica,"* "Eyn Deutsch Theologia" exerted a great influence on the times of the Reformation. This work was edited by Luther in 1518,[2] and in the preface he speaks of it "as a noble work, which sets forth clearly what Adam and what Christ is, and how Adam is to die and Christ

[1] English translation of his *Sermons* with a short life by Catherine Winkworth. London, 1857. Edited by Dr. Hitchcock, New York, 1858.

[2] The best edition is by PFEIFFER. Third edition. Guetersloh, 1855. The best English translation by Susanna Winkworth, 1874.

to rise in us." Nearly one hundred editions have been published, and the work has been translated into many languages.

Tauler and the *"German Theology"* perpetuated the speculations of Eckhart. The work itself treats principally of the incarnation of God in Christ, and urges the sacrifice of one's self, in order to fulfil better the will of God.

6) JOHN WICLIF[1] (d. 1384), "the Morning Star of the Reformation," wrote his chief work *"Trialogus"* in 1382, in which he fully sets forth his theological views. His formal principle was the absolute authority of Scripture, and his material princple the absolute causality of God. His great problem is to represent the incarnation from a moral point of view, and he loves to set forth Christ as the centre of humanity. His view of the Incarnation and Atonement led him to renounce all trust in human merit and to protest against the worship of relics and images, and the sale of indulgences. He denied the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, taught absolute predestination, believed in purgatory, and held some peculiarly erratic views on the nature and intent of marriage, and many germs of error and extravagance may be detected in his speculations, much as these were overbalanced by the noble witness which he bore to long-forgotten truths, and by the virtues of his private life.[2]

[1] See Vaughan: *John de Wycliffe, a Monograph.* London, 1853. Also Lechler: *Johann von Wiclif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation.* 2 vols. Leipsic, 1873. Translated into English, with important additional notes by Lorimer, under the title: *John Wiclif and his English Precursors.* 2 vols. London, 1878; in 1 vol. 1881. New edition by Dr. S. G. Green, 1 vol., 1884. (This work supersedes all others.)

[2] See Hardwick: *Church History* (Middle Ages), pp. 374—390. Third edition. London, 1872.

7) JOHN HUSS[1] (d. 1415), inferior to Wiclif in speculative talent and constructive faculty, was more evangelical than the English Reformer. His principal work is *"De Ecclesia,"* "On the Church." He regarded the Scriptures as an infallible authority, and defined the Church to be the body of the elect, basing his views upon the teaching of Augustine. A great student and admirer of Wiclif, he died a martyr because he based his reform of the Church upon conscience and Scripture, and not upon ecclesiastical authority.

8) JOHAN WESSEL[2] (d. 1489), "the light of the world," "the Master of contradictions," was the most prominent of the precursors of the Reformation in Germany. Luther, who published a collection of the works of Wessel, in 1522, says of him, in the preface, that if he had not written anything before he read these words, people might have thought that he had stolen his ideas from him.[3] On many points, on justification, penance, purgatory, etc., he anticipated the Reformation.

His definition of the Church is of special interest. He says: "I believe with the Church, but I do not believe in her." The Church to him is a *communio sanctorum,* the community of saints, and not a *communio prædestinatorum* as Wiclif and Huss have it. Wessel was alike distinguished as a theologian and as a general scholar.

9) JOHANN VON WESEL (d. 1481) wrote against the doctrine of indulgences *(Adversus Indulgentias)* and on "Ecclesiastical Power." On his trial (he escaped the stake, but was locked up for life in an Augustinian

[1] See Gillett: *Life and times of John Huss.* Third edition. Boston, 1870. Also LECHLER in Schaff-Herzog.

[2] See especially ULLMAN, already quoted.

[3] "Wenn ich den Wessel zuvor gelesen, so liessen meine Widersacher sich duenken, Luther hätte Alles vom Wessel genommen, also stimmet unser beider Geist zusammen."

convent at Mayence) the principal charges against him were, that he denied the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, rejected tradition, and disputed the absolute authority of a council legitimately called. He taught the formal principle of Protestantism, — the Scriptures the sole rule of faith,— but he did not fully reach the material principle,— justification by faith alone.

6. *The Humanists.*

The Humanists, the critical spirit of the age, and the study of the Bible, co-operated in preparing the way for the Reformation. The humanists were the philologians and critics of their age; they restored the purity of the Latin language, made the study of Greek an indispensable element of scholarly education, and introduced the study of Hebrew. In Germany these studies were chiefly cultivated by the "Brethren of the Common Life," and from this school the Reformation received great assistance. Though they aided in the work, the Humanists would never have effected the Reformation.

§ 17. The Dogmatics of the Century of the Reformation.[1]

The sixteenth century was full of fresh speculation and practical life, with a harmony of the intellectual, experimental, and practical, almost without a parallelism in the history of the Church.

[1] Krauth: *The Conservative Reformation and its Theology.* Philadelphia, 1871. Seiss: *Ecclesia Lutherana.* Fourth edition. Philadelphia, 1871. Schmid: *The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church,* exhibited and verified from the original sources. Second English edition. Philadelphia, 1889.

The two sorts of Dogmatics, the Lutheran and the Reformed, may be characterized as the theology of Salvation, and the theology of the Absolute Will.

1. *The Dogmatics of Melanchthon.*[1]

The impress of the character of Luther upon the Lutheran Church is so mighty that no one can understand the doctrines of the Church without understanding him. For the whole early history of our Church is interwoven with the personal and official history of LUTHER[2] (d. 1546).

But it was MELANCHTHON (d. 1560), who wrote the first Protestant work of Systematic theology, under the title *"Loci Communes,"*[3] of which three editions appeared in 1521. In this work he sought to give the theological and religious results of the Reformation, and pursued the dialectic rather than the speculative method, making accurate definitions and clear divisions. In this first edition he follows closely the Epistle to the

[1] The first complete edition of his works is given by Bretschneider and Bindseil in the *Corpus Reformatorum.* Vols. 1—28. Halle, 1834—50. Ledderhose's *Life of Melanchthon* (Heidelberg, 1847) has been translated into English by Dr. Krotel, Philadelphia, 1855.

On Melanchthon's *Theology* see Plitt: *Melanchthon's Loci in ihrer Urgestalt*, Erlangen, 1864; Herrlinger: *Die Theologie Melanchthons, etc.*, Gotha, 1879.

[2] The best serviceable edition of Luther's works is the Erlangen edition in 67 German and 39 Latin volumes (1826—86). The most valuable biographies are by Koestlin: *Martin Luther, sein Leben und seine Schriften*, third edition, 2 vols., Elberfeld, 1883; also his smaller work, *Luther's Leben*, third edition, Leipsic, 1883, English translation, London, New York, and Philadelphia, 1883; Bayne: *Life of Luther*, 2 vols., 1887.

On Luther's *Theology* see Koestlin: *Luther's Theologie*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1863; Harnack: *Luther's Theologie*, 2 vols., Erlangen, 1862—1886.

[3] On his relation to the Augsburg Confession and Apology see pp. 116—119. On his vacillations in statements of doctrine see pp. 126, 127.

Romans in his delineation of the fundamental doctrines of sin and grace. But after 1533 he departed farther and farther from the views of Luther, and in the second great edition of his *Loci,* in 1535, and his third, 1543, he made many alterations and emphasized his so-called *Synergism.* He mentions three causes as concurring in the work of conversion —"the Word of God, the Spirit, and the human will assenting to, and not rejecting, the Word of God."[1]

He everywhere insists upon his doctrinal agreement with Luther, and does, in fact, agree with him in making all prominent the doctrine of salvation by faith in Christ, but the Melanchthon of the later period differed very considerably in doctrinal views from Luther.

His vacillations, real and seeming, were due to his timidity and gentleness of character, his aversion to controversy, his philosophical, humanistic, and classical cast of thought, and his extreme delicacy in matters of style; his excessive reverence for the testimony of the Church, and her ancient writers, and his anxiety that peace and harmony should be restored to the Church. The friends of the Reformation were embarrassed and confounded, its enemies delighted and encouraged, by preceiving endless diversities of statement in the editions of books, rapidly succeeding each other, books which, in their first form, Luther had endorsed as of Canonical purity and worthy of immortality. The very Confessions of the Church, determined by her authorities, and signed by her representatives, were amended, enlarged here, abridged there, changed in structure and statement, as the restless spirit of refining in thought or style moved Melanchthon.[2]

[1] "Concurrent tres causæ bonæ actionis, verbum Dei, Sp. S., et humana voluntas assentiens nec repugnans verbo Dei."

[2] This paragraph is condensed from Krauth's *Conservative Reformation,* pp. 289—290.

The three works of Melanchthon in which the changes were most noted and most mischievous, are: 1) the Augsburg Confession; 2) the Apology, and 3) the Loci Communes.[1]

It was as the author of the *Loci* that his influence continued to be felt years after his death, because this work served, for almost a century, as the basis and model of the dogmatic teaching of the Lutheran Church.

As an *exegete,* Melanchthon does not occupy the same prominent position as Luther. He insisted upon the literal sense in contrast to the four senses of the scholastic (literal, moral, mystical, allegorical).

Melanchthon also exerted a wide influence in the de-

[1] Before the death of Melanchthon, in 1560, this work had been reprinted nearly 80 times in various editions (17 of the text of 1521, 14 of the text of 1535, and 34 of that of 1543). These three important editions of the *Loci* (1521, 1535, 1543), with valuable prolegomena, are edited by Bretschneider and Bindseil in Vol. 21 of *Corpus Reformatorum.* In Vol. 22, they give an account of the various translations of the *Loci* (three in High German—1. by Spalatin, nine editions from 1522—1526; 2. by Justus Jonas, eight editions from 1536—1540; 3. by Justus Jonas, revised and improved by Melanchthon, nine editions from 1542—1559; two in Low German, and translations in Italian, French, Dutch, etc.), and carefully edit the translation made by Justus Jonas and revised by Melanchthon.

The cheap edition of the *Loci,* published by Schlawitz, Berlin, 1856, is a reprint of the Leipsic edition of 1559, the last published during the life of Melanchthon.

After a brief preface Melanchthon in 24 sections presents his whole system: 1. De Deo; 2. De creatione; 3. De causa peccati et de contingentia; 4. De humanis viribus seu de libero arbitrio; 5. De peccato; 6. De lege divina; 7. De evangelio; 8. De gratia et de justificatione; 9. De bonis operibus; 10. De discrimine veteris et novi Testamenti; 11. De discrimine peccati mortalis et venialis; 12. De ecclesia; 13. De Sacramentis; 14. De praedestinatione; 15. De regno Christi; 16. De resurrectione mortuorum; 17. De spiritu et litera; 18. De calamitatibus et de cruce, et de veris consolationibus; 19. De invocatione Dei seu de precatione; 20. De magistratibus civilibus et dignitate rerum politicarum; 21. De ceremoniis humanis in ecclesia; 22. De mortificatione carnis; 23. De scandalo; 24. De libertate christiana. *With two Appendixes:* 1. De conjugo; 2. Definitiones multarum appellationum quarum in ecclesia usus est.

partment of Homiletics, though he never preached from the pulpit, not having been ordained, and has been regarded as the author, in the Protestant Church, of the methodical style of preaching which follows the text or the subject. His influence in the departments of *Philology* and *Pedagogy* entitles him to the name of "the Preceptor of Germany." He laid great stress upon classical studies, and advocated a close and necessary connection of the School and the Church, regarding the School as the nursery of the Church.[1]

2. *The Melanchthonian School of Dogmatics.*

1) VICTORIN STRIGEL (d. 1569), a pupil of Melanchthon, was a strong advocate of *Synergism*.[2] A public controversy lasting fifteen days was held between him and *Flacius*, in 1560, at Weimar. The only point discussed was the relation of the human will to divine grace in the work of conversion. It was a conflict between the Melanchthonian theology and strict Lutheranism. It was in the heat of this controversy that *Flacius* made the assertion, that original sin was the very *substance* of human nature, since the fall, and not something *accidental*,— which he would not afterwards retract, and thus gave occasion to the Flacian controversy.

2) NICOLAS SELNECCER (d. 1592), was also one of Melanchthon's pupils, and one of the authors of the Formula of Concord, and to him we owe the Latin translation of the Formula. In his "*Institutiones*

[1] Compare the excellent article of LANDERER in *Herzog (First* edition). Herrlinger has rewritten this article for the *second* edition.

[2] *Tres sunt causæ efficientes conversionis: Deus, verbum, et voluntas hominis.* His *Loci theologici*, edited by Pezel (4 vols., 1582—85), is the best Dogmatics of the Melanchthonian type of theology.

Christianæ Religionis" (1563), a commentary on the *Loci* of Melanchthon, which is the first system of dogmatic theology in the Lutheran Church which contains the so-called *Prolegomena,* he still represented the Melanchthonian type of theology, but this was corrected in accordance with the teaching of the *Formula of Concord* in his later works.

3) MARTIN CHEMNITZ (d. 1586) was the greatest of Melanchthon's pupils, "without doubt the prince of the theologians of the Augsburg Confession,"[1] "that great theologian of our Church, whom no one will refuse to assign the chief place after Luther among the defenders of the Gospel truth,"[2] and as one of the authors of the Formula of Concord, left the impress of his theological learning upon it. His *"Loci Theologici"*[3] is a commentary upon the *Loci Communes* of Melanchthon, which he corrects wherever Melanchthon departs from the doctrine of our Church. In this work Chemnitz displays his accuracy and clearness in the definition of doctrine, his prudent choice of matter and his knowledge of Scripture. His *"Examen Concilii Tridentini"*[4] is the ablest defence of Protestantism ever published.

DR. KRAUTH:[5] "The learning of Chemnitz was something colossal, but it has no tinge of pedantry. His judgment was of the highest order. His modesty and simplicity, his clearness of thought, and his luminous style, his firmness in principle, and his gentleness in tone, the richness of his learning and the vigor of his thinking, have revealed themselves in such measure in

[1] Quenstedt.
[2] Buddeus.
[3] Published after his death by Polycarp Leyser in 1591.
[4] Published in four parts, 1565—73. Reprinted by Preuss, Berlin, 1861. A condensed German translation was published in St. Louis, 1875, (also Dresden).
[5] In *Conservative Reformation,* p. 310.

his "Loci," his books "On the Two Natures of Our Lord," and "On the True Presence," in his "Examen of the Council of Trent," his "Defence of the Formula of Concord," and his "Harmony of the Gospels," as to render each a classic in its kind, and to mark their author as the greatest theologian of his time — one of the greatest theologians of all time."

4) JACOB HEERBRAND (d. 1600), professor of theology at Tuebingen after 1557, through his principal work *"Compendium Theologicum,"* which was generally used as a text-book in Germany, Denmark, and Sweden, and which had almost symbolical authority in Wuertemberg, exerted a wide influence. The book is in the form of questions and answers, and presents very clearly and simply the Lutheran doctrines in a biblical manner. On account of the negotiations going on, at the time, between the Patriarch of Constantinople and the University of Tuebingen, it was translated into Greek. This writer, and the following writers of this century, no longer followed Melanchthon, but adopted strict Lutheran views, and closely adhered to the *Formula of Concord.*

5) MATTHIAS HAFENREFFER (d. 1619), professor of theology at Tuebingen after 1598, in his *"Loci Theologici,"* follows the synthetic method, starting from the highest principle, God, and proceeding to Man, to Christ, to Redemption, until the system ends in the doctrine of the Last Things. This work was the text-book generally used at the Universities (Tuebingen, Upsala, etc.), during the seventeenth century. "It obtained at once the widest currency in upper and lower Germany, because it gave in the most precise and intelligible manner the doctrinal points of the Formula of Concord,

which was what they wanted to hear exclusively in the Lutheran lecture rooms."[1]

3. *The Reformed Dogmatics.*

1) ZWINGLI[2] (d. 1531) gives us the most complete, though not a systematic, presentation of his views in his *"Commentarius de vera et falsa religione,"* published in 1525. Unlike Luther, he was not led to be a reformer by any inward experience, but by classical culture, and a scientific study of the Bible. The doctrine of justification by faith, therefore, was by no means so central and vital with him as with Luther. He began his work, not so much with the purification of doctrine, as with external improvements in worship, order, and customs. He laid stress upon the absoluteness of God and the exclusiveness of his will, so that the material principle of Zwingli is the glory of God. Acknowledging as his formal principle the exclusive authority of Scripture as a Rule of Faith he often did violence to the Word of God, for he approached it externally, and explained the Scriptures according to his subjective judgment. He regarded the sacraments as only commemorative signs, and he had such superficial views of original sin and guilt, that he regarded even heathen, like Socrates and Cato, without further qualifications, as members of the kingdom of God,—of which view Luther says: "If this is true, then the whole Gospel is false."[3] His speculations led him to adopt a *fatalistic* predestination, which deprives the will of

[1] Heppe.

[2] Zeller: *Das theologische System Zwingle's*, Tübingen, 1853. Sigwart: *Zwingli, der Character seiner Theologie, etc.*, Stuttgart, 1855. Hottinger: *Life of Zwingli* (translated by T. C. Porter), Harrisburg, 1857. Usteri: *Zwingli*, Zurich, 1883. Grob: *The Life of Zwingli*, New York, 1883.

[3] *Hoc si verum est, totum evangelium falsum est.*

moral freedom, as over against divine *providence.* SCHAFF[1]: "Zwingli lacked the genius and depth of Luther and Calvin, the learning of Melanchthon and Oecolampadius, but he was their equal in honesty of purpose, integrity of character, heroic courage, and devotion to the cause of the Reformation, and surpassed them in liberality. His prominent intellectual trait was clear, strong common sense. He had no organ for the mystic element in religion... In his theological views he was more radical than Luther... He differed chiefly from his view of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament, and held this ordinance to be merely a commemoration of the atoning death of Christ... In some articles he was ahead of his age, and held opinions which were then deemed dangerous and heretical. He had a milder view of original sin and guilt than the other Reformers... Zwingli represents only the first stage in the history of the Reformed Church. His work was completed after his death by his successor, Bullinger, at Zurich, and still more by Calvin at Geneva."

2) JOHN CALVIN[2] (d. 1564), the founder of Calvinism, wrote his famous work, *"Institutes of the Christian Religion,"* in 1536, when he was twenty-seven years old. The final form was given to the *Institutes* in the Latin edition of Geneva, 1559, when it was made into a treatise of four books, divided into one hundred and four chapters. In the first three books he follows the order of the Apostles' Creed, and in the fourth book

[1] In *Johnson's Cyclopædia.*

[2] There is an English translation of Calvin's works by the "Calvin Translation Society," in 52 vols., Edinburgh, 1842—53. On his *Life* see Dyer: *Life of Calvin*, London, 1849; Bungener: *Calvin*, Paris, 1862 (English translation, Edinburgh, 1863); but especially Stähelin: *Johannes Calvin*, 2 vols., Elberfeld, 1863. See also Schaff: *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. 1, pp. 421—465.

treats of the Church.[1] As a system this work of Calvin is more comprehensive, and more complete in its formal scientific construction, than the *Loci* of Melanchthon. Although Calvin far surpassed Zwingli in religious depth and fervor, and closely approximated the views of Luther, still, in the fundamental *principle* of his system, he stood on the same basis as Zwingli. He was decidedly hostile to ecclesiastical tradition, and on the doctrine of the person of Christ differed greatly from Luther, and therefore could not apprehend the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the fulness of Luther's faith. The inexorable consistency with which he carried out his views of predestination, made them exceed Augustine's doctrine in inflexible rigidity and severity.[2] The five points of Calvinism are: 1) unconditional election; 2) limited atonement, designed for the elect alone; 3) the total moral inability of the will; 4) irresistible grace; and 5) the perseverance of the saints.

3) PETER MARTYR VERMILIUS (d. 1562), in his *"Loci Communes,"* which is one of the principal sources for the study of the Reformed theology of the sixteenth century, was Zwinglian in his doctrine.

4) BULLINGER (d. 1575), the author of the "Second Helvetic Confession," 1566, one of the most elaborate of the Reformed Creeds, and next to the Heidelberg

[1] The first edition (Latin, Basel, 1536) contained only six chapters: 1) Of Law, with an exposition of the Ten Commandments; 2) Of Faith, with an exposition of the Apostles' Creed; 3) Of Prayer, with an exposition of the Lord's Prayer; 4) Of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; 5) Of the other so-called Sacraments; 6) Of Christian Liberty, Church Government and Discipline.

[2] For an excellent article on *Calvinism* by Dr. A. A. Hodge see *Johnson's Cyclopædia.* He speaks of the "Institutes," as "the first and grandest work of systematic divinity the world has seen," that in it Calvin "has recast Augustinianism in its final Protestant form, and handed it over to the modern world stamped with its great author's name."

Catechism the most authoritative, contributed much to establish the Reformation in Switzerland.[1] His "*Compendium religionis christianæ*" appeared in 1556, in which, however, he did not lay so much stress on absolute predestination.

5) WOLFGANG MUSCULUS (d. 1563) was originally in favor of a union between the Lutheran and the Reformed Church, but afterwards saw fit to change his views, and in his "*Loci Communes*,"[2] took a strong Calvinistic position.

6) ARETIUS (d. 1574), professor of theology at Berne (1563—74), exercised considerable influence through his "*Theologiæ Problemata*," and his "*Examen Theologicum*" ran through six editions in fourteen years.

7) ZACHARIAS URSINUS (d. 1583), the chief author of the "Heidelberg Catechism" (1563), was a man of profound classical, philosophical, and theological learning. He was no orator, and no man of action, but a retired, modest, and industrious student. His principal works, beside the Heidelberg Catechism, are a "Commentary" on the Catechism, and an attack on the *Formula of Concord*.[3]

8) OLEVIANUS (d. 1587), joint author of the "Heidelberg Catechism" with Ursinus, was inferior to Ursinus in learning, but his superior in the pulpit and in Church government. In the doctrines of the Lord's Supper and predestination, he held the views of Calvin. He has been regarded as the forerunner of the "federal theology" of Cocceius (d. 1669).

9) HYPERIUS (d. 1564), professor of theology at Marburg (1542—64), exercised a considerable influence on the formation of evangelical theology. His

[1] See Schaff: *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. 1, pp. 390—420.
[2] Basel, 1560, and afterward often reprinted.
[3] See Schaff: *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. 1, pp. 529—534.

"Topica theologica" (1561) was extensively used even by Roman Catholic preachers.

10) ZANCHI (d. 1590) acquired a great reputation as one of the most learned theologians of his time. He strongly advocated the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, and attacked the Lutheran doctrine of the Person of Christ.

§ 18. The Orthodox Dogmatics of the Seventeenth Century.

The orthodox dogmatics of the seventeenth century had the character in some measure of a revived and purified scholasticism, running out in some extreme cases into a sort of Protestant Mediævalism. But it was more profound than the theology of the Early Fathers, more true and consistent than that of the Scholastics, and more scientifically developed and honestly outspoken than the dogmatics of the Roman Catholic Church.

1. *The Characteristic of the Dogmatics of this period.*[1]

During the latter part of the sixteenth century the Lutheran Church had undergone the ordeal of a war

[1] In order to form a clear conception of the history of the dogmatic development of the Lutheran Church in the 17th century, we must take into consideration, 1) The three general tendencies which were at work in Lutheran Germany, and 2) the internal controversies which agitated the Lutheran Church during this period.

1) Of the general tendencies at work the *first* was a strong Roman Catholic reaction, supported by political power, kindled and fermented by the Jesuits, a reaction which culminated in the Thirty Years' War (1618—1648), of which Gustavus Adolphus, of Sweden, is the hero.

The *second* general tendency was a strongly-marked Calvinizing

of polemics. The precision, clearness and carefulness of the Formula of Concord had gradually overcome all opposition to it, and had in fact really restored harmony within the Church.

movement, also started and abetted by political power, by which Lutheran Germany lost several states.

The *third* general tendency were the Unionistic efforts, which instead of restoring religious unity, only made the breach wider. These Unionistic efforts were of a two-fold character: *a)* The attempt to bring about a reconciliation between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants (The Conference of Thorn, 1645, known as the *Colloquium Caritativum*, the Conference of *Courteous Compliments*, and the correspondence between Bossuet and Leibnitz in 1691); *b)* the attempt to bring about a reconciliation between the Lutherans and the Reformed (The Colloquy of Leipsic, 1631, and of Cassel, 1661).

2) A reaction against the so-called Scholasticism and one-sidedness of the Lutheran Church could not fail to take place within the Church herself. The opposition which sprang up was of a two-fold character: *a)* in the case of Calixtus and the Syncretistic controversies it was confined exclusively to the sphere of theology; *b)* in Spener and the Pietistic controversy, it more largely concerned the Christian life. And though the opposition which arose was marked by a one-sidedness of another sort, still these controversies had a beneficial influence upon the spiritual life of the Lutheran Church.

a) The Syncretistic Controversy. By *Syncretism* we mean a tendency to form a union between two religious bodies on the basis of such doctrines or tenets as are common to both. There are two tendencies discernible throughout the whole Reformation period, the one condemning all toleration of different opinions as an unsoundness of doctrine, the other striving after reconciliation and harmony between the different religious bodies. In the middle of the seventeenth century these two tendencies came into violent conflict with each other. The controversy originated in the views of the great Helmstädt theologian, George Calixtus. On his side were the theologians of Helmstädt and Königsberg, and opposed to them were the more rigid Lutheran theologians of Leipsic, Dresden and Wittenberg, led by John Huelseman of Leipsic, and above all by Abraham Calovius of Wittenberg, who alone wrote 26 controversial books, many of them more than a thousand pages quarto.

b) The Pietistic Controversy. Pietism denotes a movement in the Lutheran Church which arose as a reaction of the living, practical faith against an orthodoxy which too often contented itself with a theoretical correctness of its creed. In the 17th century we have only to do with Pietism in its early stage, and the whole movement centers around the person of Philip Jacob Spener (d. 1705).

Now came a period of comparatively internal repose, the mediæval period of Lutheran Theology, when the theological system of our Church was fully developed, reared like a glorious Gothic edifice, massive in architecture, rich in construction, and finished in beauty, even to the last of its marvelous adornings. But this tendency to an accurate delineation and precise definition of doctrine became more and more one-sided. Like Mediæval Scholasticism, in its concern for logic it almost lost vitality. Nevertheless, this scholastic orthodoxy, with all its one-sidedness, imparted to Lutheran theology a fulness and wealth, an acuteness and consistency of structure, the grandeur of which the greatest theologians of all denominations are compelled to acknowledge. We can conceive of men of intellect studying this system without receiving it in every part; but we conceive it impossible for a man of high intellect to master the system of our Church without admiring it.

And though this period of our Church is often reviled as that of "dead orthodoxy," it cannot be denied that it possessed more true piety and spiritual life than the eighteenth century, that period which most derided it, —and that it is far superior to this present century, with all its boasted progress, and scientific attainments, in steadfastness of faith, in earnest devotion, in consecration to God, and in strict adherence to the doctrines of God's Word and to the teachings of our Confessions. A century which has produced a Johann Arndt (d. 1621), a Valerius Herberger (d. 1627), a John Gerhard (d. 1637), a Johann Andreæ (d. 1654), a Heinrich Mueller (d. 1675), a Paul Gerhardt (d. 1676), a Christian Scriver (d. 1701), and a Spener (d. 1705), can not be altogether an age of spiritual coldness, and a

period in the history of the Church as black at is has generally been painted.

DR. WALTHER[1]: The theological works of the seventeenth century "exhibit, not only acording to the judgment of all Lutherans who are faithful to the Confession, the very best results that have ever been attained in the Christian Church of all ages, so far as correct presentation, thorough development and organic arrangement of the doctrines of the Bible are concerned, and are therefore of imperishable value, but even according to the testimony of men who do not unreservedly subscribe to the Confessions of our Church, yea even of its enemies, these works belong to the most admirable productions of the earnest spirit of Christian research, which even now every one must make himself perfectly familiar with, if he wishes to learn the doctrines of our Church in their peculiar features, their wealth, and their self-consistency; or even if, in general, he wishes to be capable of forming a well-tested judgment in the department of Dogmatics.

2. *The divers tendencies of the Orthodox Dogmatics.*[2]

Laxity in CALIXTUS (d. 1656), rigidity in CALOVIUS (d. 1686), moderation in MUSÆUS (d. 1681), represent the great universities which these great men adorn, Helmstädt, Wittenberg, and Jena.

GEORGE CALIXTUS, for forty-two years (1614—1656) professor of theology at Helmstädt, was, in the seventeenth century, the most prominent and influential representative of the school of Melanchthon. A man of superior scientific and social accomplishments, a thor-

[1] In a criticism of Schmid's *Dogmatik der Evang. Luth. Kirche.*
[2] See H. Schmid: "Geschichte der synkret. Streitigkeiten," etc., Erlangen, 1846; Gass: "Calixtus und der Synkretismus," Breslau, 1846.

ough student of Church History, rich in the culture which can only be obtained by extensive travels, Calixtus, being of an irenical turn of mind, formed a more liberal judgment of other denominations than was commonly held. He did not, indeed, desire a formal union of the various Churches, but he held that they should recognize, tolerate, and love one another. He proposed a secondary principle of Christian theology (next to the Holy Scriptures as its primary principle), the *consensus* of the first five centuries as a common basis for all Churches, and sought to show that all subsequent diversities were either non-essential or less essential.[1] But the more rigid Lutheran theologians, who were mistrustful of all peaceful measures, ever since the trouble with crypto-Calvinism at the end of the sixteenth century, accused Calixtus of crypto-Calvinism, in fact Calixtus was attacked on all sides, and by no one more furiously than by that strict defender of orthodoxy, Abraham Calovius of Wittenberg.

CALOVIUS was the prodigy of his age, the most voluminous of our theologians, writing on all departments of theological science, distinguished for his wonderful industry, unyielding firmness and severity, vast and varied learning, and his most remarkable zeal in controversy. Although ranking high as a dogmatician, still the conspicuous position which he occupied in the theological world of the seventeenth century is owing principally to his violent polemics against Calixtus, and against that reconciliating tendency which was represented by the University of Helmstädt. In 1655 the Theological Faculties of Leipsic and Wittenberg, of which Calovius was the ruling spirit, prepared a statement of the divergences between the Book of Concord

[1] See Kurtz in his *Church History*. Vol. 3, §159, 2.

and the principles enforced by the school of Calixtus. They hoped to make this formal document[1] authoritative, and of symbolical character, but it was never legally ratified.

MUSÆUS, of Jena, who was strongly opposed to the exact and fixed definitions which were then used in Lutheran orthodox dogmatics, in vain sought to mediate between these two parties.

3. *The Dogmaticians of this period.*

1) AEGIDIUS HUNNIUS (d. 1603), professor of theology at Marburg 1576—92, and at Wittenberg 1591—1603, was one of Heerbrand's pupils, and a staunch champion of Lutheran orthodoxy. While at Marburg, he opposed the reigning Calvinistic tendency, especially in Christology *(De persona Christi,* 1585), and in Wittenberg he contributed greatly in suppressing Melanchthonian views. In 1603 he wrote *De providentia Dei et æterna prædestinatio* against HUBER'S false view, that election is universal and entirely unlimited. John Gerhard calls him "the best of the recent theologians."

2) LEONARD HUTTER (d. 1616), professor of theology at Wittenberg from 1596 until his death, was the most prominent theologian of his age. His resemblance to Luther in vigor of mind, energy of action, unwearied industry, firmness in faith, and boldness in proclaiming truth and sharply rebuking error, gave him the title of *"Redonatus Lutherus."* He was a typical representative of Lutheran orthodoxy in its older form, before

[1] The title was: *Consensus Repetitus fidei vere Lutheranæ*, and it was arranged under 98 heads or articles. Each of the heads was subdivided into three parts. The first division declared the true Lutheran doctrine: *Profitemur et docent.* The second stated the opinion condemned: *Rejicimus.* The third, under the form of *Ita docent*, contained extracts from the writings of Calixtus, or, in a few cases, of his followers.

its scholastic development, while it still confined itself to reproductions and polemics. His best known work is his *"Compendium Locorum Theologicorum,"*[1] published in 1610, which, for nearly a century, was almost universally used in the theological schools of Germany, superseding the *Loci Communes* of Melanchthon. It is brief, concise, and comprehensive, arranged in the form of questions and answers, and for its definitions mainly uses the words of the Symbolical Books, and of the older theologians, Chemnitz and Aegidius Hunnius. At least eight of our theologians have made this compend a basis for other works.[2] Huelsemann of Leipsic (d. 1661) esteemed the study of this Compend as of no less importance than that of the Symbolical Books themselves.[3] Hutter's *"Loci Communes Theologici,"* published in 1619, three years after his death, by the theological faculty of Wittenberg, is simply a further

[1] Many editions of this excellent work have been published, and it has been translated into German three times (in 1611, by Hutter himself in 1613, by Francke in 1837), into Swedish (Stockholm, 1618), and into English (by Doctors Jacobs and Spieker, Philadelphia, 1868).

It presents the whole subject-matter of Dogmatics, arranged in the Synthetic manner, under 34 *loci* or articles: 1) De Scriptura Sacra, 2) De Deo uno et trino, 3) De duabus naturis in una persona Christi, 4) De creatione, 5) De angelis bonis et malis, 6) De imagine Dei in homine, 7) De aeterna Dei providentia, 8) De paccato in genere et in specie, 9) De libero arbitrio, 10) De lege Dei, 11) De evangelio, 12) De justificatione, 13) De aeterna praedestinatione, 14) De bonis operibus, 15) De poenitentia et confessione, 16) De ministerio et ordine ecclesiastico, 17) De ecclesia, 18) De libertate Christiana, 19) De sacramentis in genere, 20) De baptismo, 21) De coena Domini, 22) De sacrificiis et de missa pontifica, 23) De scandalo, 24) De cruce et consolationibus, 25) De invocatione, 26) De votis monasticis, 27) De magistratu et rebus civilibus, 28) De matrimonio, 29) De morte corporis deque immortalitate animae, 30) De consummatione sive fine mundi, 31) De resurrectione mortuorum, 32) De extremo judicio, 33) De inferno, 34) De vita aeterna.

[2] Cundisius (1648), Glassius (1656), Christian Chemnitz (1670), Bechmann (1690), Schneider, Leuschner, Ebart, Deutschmann, etc.

[3] See Dr. Jacobs' *Preface* to English translation of *Compend.*

elaboration of the *Compendium*. The Lutheran Church is also indebted to Hutter for the direction which his instructions gave to the mind of JOHN GERHARD.

3) JOHN GERHARD (d. 1637), the greatest of all Lutheran theologians, "combined rare learning, great acuteness, wonderful industry, sound judgment, and practical ability with ardent piety."[1] Bossuet is said to be the author of the often quoted remark that Gerhard is the third (Luther, Chemnitz, Gerhard) in that series of Lutheran theologians in which there is no fourth. It is by his great work *"Loci Theologici,"*[2] that he gained his great fame.

[1] Luthardt.

[2] This work was begun in 1610 and completed in 1621. The best edition is that of Cotta (Tuebingen, 1762—87, 22 vols.). For practical purposes the edition of Preuss (1863—85), in 9 vols., will answer. A very full index published in 1885 greatly adds to the value of this edition, which also preserves in the margin the paging of Cotta's edition. So important is this work of Gerhard, that we will attempt to indicate in a brief analysis the comprehensiveness with which each doctrine is discussed. A more detailed analysis of his mode of treating some of the more important doctrines will be given later, in the dogmatic system itself. (The paging given in this analysis refers to the large quarto edition of Preuss, 9 vols., 1863—1885.)

Book I. Locus 1. De Scriptura Sacra (Chapters 27, pp. 13—240); 2. De natura Dei et attributis divinis (Ch. 8, pp. 241—370); 3. De sanctissimo Trinitatis mysterio (Ch. 13, pp. 371—446); 4. De persona et officio Christi (Ch. 15, pp. 447—608).

Book II. Locus 5. De creatione et angelis (Ch. 6, pp. 1—16); 6. De providentia (Ch. 15, pp. 17—47); 7. De electione et reprobatione (Ch. 14, pp. 48—106); 8. De imagine Dei in homine (Ch. 10, pp. 107—141); 9. De peccato originali (Ch. 10, pp. 142—182); 10. De peccatis actualibus (Ch. 26, pp. 183—237); 11. De libero arbitrio (Ch. 12, pp. 238—282).

Book III. Locus 12. De lege Dei (Sections 208, pp. 1—108); 13. De legibus ceremonialibus et forensibus (Sec. 44, pp. 109—140); 14. De evangelio (Sec. 130, pp. 141—202); 15. De poenitentia (Sec. 145, pp. 203—299); 16. De justificatione per fidem (Sec. 251, pp. 300—520).

Book IV. Locus 17. De bonis operibus (Sections 147, pp. 1—136); 18. De sacramentis (Sec. 109, pp. 137—219); 19. De circumcisione et agno paschali (Sec. 68, pp. 220—255); 20. De sacro baptismo (Sec. 271, pp. 256—398).

LUTHARDT: "A more careful exgetical treatment than is found in his predecessors, the comprehensive consideration of the material afforded by the history of dogmas, the most thorough elaboration of every question, the objectiveness of its judgment, and its firmness in polemics, combined with the reference to the practical and consolatory use of the individual dogmas, distinguish this work, which also through its copious application of the scholastic theology (especially in the doctrine of God), and its employment, although still in a moderate degree, of the scholastic form, was of the most significant influence upon works which followed it."

THOLUCK: "The progress that Gerhard made beyond Chemnitz and Hutter consists partly in a more perfect systematization, partly in a deeper and more speculative argumentation of the dogmas, but especially in the completeness and comprehensiveness of the treatment."

KAHNIS: "The strength of this work does not lie in the systematic arrangement of the material, but in the thorough elaboration of the individual doctrines, according to the entire extent of their exegetical, dogmatico-historical, symbolical, polemical, and practical material."

BUDDEUS: "Those who admire his industry, but overlook his sound judgment, prove thereby that they them-

Book V. Locus 21. De sacra coena (Ch. 26, pp. 1—253); 22. De ecclesia (Ch. 13, Sec. 305, pp. 254—602).

Book VI. Locus 23. De ministerio ecclesiastico (Ch. 10, Sec 375, pp. 1—265); 24. De magistratu politico (Ch. 8, Sec. 489, pp. 266—562).

Book VII. Locus 25. De conjugio (Ch. 12, Sec. 708, pp. 1—466).

Book VIII. Locus 26. De morte (Ch. 10, Sec. 487, pp. 1—391); 27. De mortuorum resurrectione (Ch. 13, Sec. 124, pp. 392—504).

Book IX. Locus 28. De extremo judicio (Ch. 11, Sec. 126, pp. 1—126); 29. De consummatione seculi (Ch. 11, Sec. 107, pp. 127—204); 30. De inferno seu morte aeterna (Ch. 13, Sec. 93, pp. 205—287); 31. De vita aeterna (Ch. 12, Sec. 177, pp. 288—427).

selves are destitute of judgment, as I am certain that they cannot produce a single example of an error in judgment."

WALTHER:[1] "In our opinion, this work is the most excellent and complete, both in contents and form, that has been produced within this department of the Christian religion, and will remain until the last day the model for all who make attempts in this sphere."

Not only was Gerhard a giant among the theologians, but he was a most successful advocate of a living Christianity, and his *"Meditationes sacræ"* show him to have been a true mystic.

4) NICOLAUS HUNNIUS (d. 1643), professor of theology at Wittenberg (1617—22), and superintendent at Luebeck after 1623, followed in the footsteps of his father, Aegidius Hunnius and, like him, was possessed of great learning. His *"Epitome Credendorum"*[2] has often been reprinted.

53 GEORGE CALIXTUS[3] (d. 1656) introduced the analytic method (which begins with the end of all theology, blessedness, and hence takes the opposite course from the synthetic) into the treatment of Dogmatics, and also separated Ethics from Dogmatics. The defender in the great Syncretistic controversy, his principal work on Dogmatics proper is his small compend *"Epitome theologiæ,"* published in 1619. In his later writings he departed widely on various doctrines from the teaching of the Lutheran Church.

6) JOHANN MUSÆUS (d. 1681), professor of theology at Jena (1646—81), possessed an excellent philosoph-

[1] All these eulogies are quoted from the sketch of Gerhard in Appendix I, to Schmid's *Doctrinal Theology.*

[2] Translated into English by GOTTHEIL, Nuremberg, 1847.

[3] Compare H. Schmid: *Gesch. des. synkret. Streitigkeiten.* Erlangen, 1846; Gass: *G. Calixtus und der Synkretismus.*

ical training and, on the one side, vindicated the application of philosophy to theology against the disciples of the stiff Lutheran orthodoxy, while on the other side, he condemned its too universal use by the theologians of the Reformed Church. He regarded theology the object not only of the *intellect*, but of the *affections*,[1] and emphasized to such a degree the sanctity of the will, that he has been regarded as a precursor of Spener. He refused to sign the *Consensus* drawn up by Calovius in 1655, and was also accused of Syncretism, and compelled in a formal way to renounce all sympathy with the views of Calixtus.[2]

7) JOHN WILLIAM BAIER (d. 1695) based his "*Compendium Theologiæ Positivæ*"[3] upon the theology of Musaeus, his father-in-law, and of "many other orthodox theologians." The author adopts the analytic method,[4] and the study of this book is an excellent introduction to the older Dogmaticians.

DR. WALTHER[5] sums up the merits of this compen-

[1] See his *Introductio in theologiam.* Jena, 1678.

[2] See *note* on page 207.

[3] A very cheap reprint by PREUSS, Berlin, 1864; another edition, enlarged by Dr. Walther, appeared in 1879—83, in 3 vols., St. Louis and Dresden.

[4] *Prolegomena.* 1. De natura theologiae; 2. De scriptura sacra.

Pars Prima. 1. De Deo; 2. De creatione; 3. De angelis; 4. De imagine Dei; 5. De providentia Dei; 6. De beatitudine aeterna; 7. De damnatione aeterna; 8. De morte temporali; 9. De resurrectione mortuorum; 10. De judicio extremo et consummatione seculi.

Pars Secunda. 1. De peccato in genere; 2. De peccato originis; 3. De paccatis actualibus.

Pars Tertia. 1. De gratia Dei; 2. De Christo: *a)* De persona Christi, *b)* De statibus exinanitionis et exaltationis; *c)* De officio Christi; 3. De fide in Christum; 4. De regeneratione et conversione; 5. De justificatione; 6. De renovatione et bonis operibus; 7. De verbo legis et evangelii; 8. De sacramentis in genere; 9. De sacramentis veteris testamenti; 10. De baptismo; 11. De sacra coena; 12. De praedestinatione; 13. De ecclesia; 14. De ministerio ecclesiastico; 15. De magistratu politico; 16. De statu et societate domestica.

[5] In vol. 1 of *Lehre und Wehre.* See Sketch of Dogmaticians in Schmid's *Doctrinal Theology.*

dium as "great completeness combined with compact brevity, exclusion of all extraneous material, exquisite selection, and, above all, accurate exegesis of scriptural proof-passages, critical comparison, and employment of the labors of his predecessors within the department of dogmatics, and, in addition to Lutheran fidelity in doctrine, the expression of a living heart-faith, and a mild, pious sensibility."

8) CONRAD DANNHAUER (d. 1666), professor of theology in the University of Strasburg, where Spener was his pupil, had considerable influence through his profound exegetical labors. In his *"Hodosophia Christiana"* he presents the dogmas in the analytical method from the standpoint of a man who is a pilgrim on his way to heaven. He was an ardent champion of Lutheran ortodoxy, and his zeal for the purity of doctrine was connected with the most earnest personal piety. He wrote against the Romanists, against the Calvinists, and against Syncretism (represented by Calixtus).

9) JOHANN HUELSEMANN (d. 1661), professor of theology at Wittenberg (1629—46), and at Leipsic after 1646, has given us two excellent works on Dogmatics. His compend *"Breviarium Theologiæ"* (1640) was enlarged in his *"Extensio breviarii"* of 1648. His opponents spoke of his style as "stilum barbarum, scholasticum, holcoticum, scoticum ac tenebrosum."

10) JOHANN FRIEDRICH KŒNIG (d. 1664), successively Swedish court-preacher, professor of theology at Greifswald (1651), superintendent of Mecklenburg and Ratzeburg (1656), and professor of theology at Rostock after 1659, was one of the "dogmatic virtuosi" of the seventeenth century. His compend *"Theologia positiva acroamatica"* was often republished, and wide-

ly used as a text-book, and forms the foundation of Quenstedt's famous work. It is more scientific than the "Compend" of Hutter. BUDDEUS: "The author comprehended much in a few words and in a forcible manner; but, by an excessive desire of brevity and accuracy, produced a mere skeleton, destitute of sap and blood."

11) JOHANN SCHERZER (d. 1683), professor of theology at Leipsic, in his *"Breviculus theologicus"* (1678) sought to present a system of dogmatics in a still shorter and more concise form than Kœnig, which, however, he enlarged in his *"Systema theologiæ"* (1680), but he is not happy in his definitions. He also wrote the best Protestant work against the Roman Catholic controversialist, Bellarmine (d. 1621).

12) ABRAHAM CALOVIUS[1] (d. 1686), professor of theology at Wittenberg after 1650, represents the strictest school of orthodoxy, and wrote ably on all departments of theology. His *"Systema Locorum Theologicorum"* (12 vols., 1655—77) is the most compact and comprehensive representation of Lutheran dogmatics, the true exemplar of what has been called Lutheran Scholasticism.[2] His writings are more polemical than dogmatical. His great exegetical work *"Biblia Illustrata"* is mainly a refutation of the Commentaries of Grotius.

13) JOHANN QUENSTEDT (d. 1688), professor of theology at Wittenberg (1649—88), has been called "the bookkeeper of the Wittenberg orthodoxy." His *"Theologia didactica polemica,"* which appeared in 1685, is one of the most important works of Lutheran theology, and is noted for its accurate classification of dogmatic material. On account of the objectivity of his treat-

[1] See p. 206 and *note* on p. 203.

[2] The first four volumes are more thorough in their treatment than the later volumes.

ment, and his thorough acquaintance with the literature of his own times, Quenstedt, next to Gerhard, is the most instructive representative of the orthodox dogmatics.

"It possesses little originality, and follows closely the outline of Kœnig, but shows the greatest erudition in its citation of authorities, and skill in rendering the work of reference easy. The objection, however, is often made, that Quenstedt, by his excessive attention to the details of his system, has deprived dogmatic theology of life, by reducing its doctrines to the shape of mathematical formulas."[1]

14) DAVID HOLLAZ (d. 1713) is especially known by his work *"Examen theologicum acroamaticum"* (1707). The great popularity of this work was not due to its originality of thought, but to the clearness and terseness of its definitions, and especially to the genial and irenic tone and the living scriptural character of its theology. He is the last of the strict Lutheran theologians, but in the period of transition between the seventeenth and eighteenth century took an intermediate position between Lutheran orthodoxy and pietism.

In the form of questions and answers he recapitulates with great clearness and compactness the results attained by his predecessors.[2]

[1] See Sketch of Quenstedt in Appendix to Schmid's *Doctrinal Theology.*

[2] The synopsis of the whole work is as follows:
Propædia Theologica.
1. De theologiae constitutione, pp. 1—34; 2. De religione et articulis fidei, pp. 34—64; 3. De scriptura sacra, pp. 64—198.
Pœdia Theologica.
Pars Prima. 1. De Deo, pp. 198—295; 2. De mysterio Trinitatis, pp. 296—361; 3. De creatione, pp. 361—385; 4. De angelis, pp. 385—416; 5. De homine, pp. 416—432; 6. De providentia divina, pp. 432—463; 7. De beatitudine aeterna, pp. 463—471.

4. *The Reformed or Calvinistic Dogmaticians of this period.*

The dogmatics of the Lutheran Church had its home in Germany and bears a character of unity and continuity; the Reformed dogmatics, on the other hand, was developed in various lands and under the influence of different schools of thought. The dogmatic theology of the Reformed Church was cultivated mainly in the Netherlands, where we meet with Arminianism and Calvinism in conflict, with a scholasticism in comparison with which that of Quenstedt is only child's play, with the philosophy of Descartes, and the federal theology of Cocceius. In England we meet with latitudinarianism and deism, and in France with the teachings of Amyraldus.

The centers of Reformed Theology, in Switzerland, were Basel, Berne, Zurich, and especially Geneva; in Germany, Heidelberg; in the Netherlands, Franeker,

Pars Secunda. 1. De imagine Dei, pp. 471—499; 2. De peccato in genere, pp. 499—516; 3. De peccato originali, pp. 516—546; 4. De peccato actuali, pp. 546—576; 5. De defectu liberi arbitrii in spiritualibus, pp. 576—592.

Pars Tertia. A. De salutis principiis. 1. De benevolentia Dei universali, pp. 593—612; 2. De praedestinatione, pp. 612—659; 3. De persona Christi, pp. 660—787; 4. De vocatione, pp. 787—812; 5. De illuminatione, pp. 813—847; 6. De conversione, pp. 848—870; 7. De regeneratione, pp. 871—888; 8. De justificatione, pp. 888—927; 9. De unione mystica, pp. 927—942; 10. De renovatione, pp. 942—958; 11. De conservatione, pp. 958—966; 12. De glorificatione, pp. 966—984.

B. De mediis salutis. 1. De verbo legis, pp. 985—1022; 2. De verbo evangelii, pp. 1022—1041; 3. De Sacramentis, pp. 1041—1067; 4. De baptismo, pp. 1067—1094; 5. De eucharista, pp. 1095—1136; 6. De poenitentia et contritione, pp. 1136—1157; 7. De fide in Christum, pp. 1157—1184; 8. De bonis operibus, pp. 1184—1214; 9. De morte et de resurrectione mortuorum, pp. 1214—1233; 10. De extremo judicio et de consummatione mundi, pp. 1233—1264.

Pars Quarta. 1. De ecclesia, pp. 1265—1325; 2. De ministerio ecclesiastico, pp. 1326—1349; 3. De magistratu politico, pp. 1350—1365; 4. De statu œconomico, pp. 1366—1384.

Utrecht, Gröningen and, above all, Leyden; in France, Saumur, Montauban, and Sedan.

a) Germany.

The Reformed theology of Germany assumed a peculiar type known as the *German Reformed* theology. Although it had a Melanchthonian element, it was still Calvinistic in its tendency. It took its origin in the Palatinate, and had received its expression in the Heidelberg Catechism (1562).

1) BARTHOLOMEW KECKERMANN (d. 1609), at one time professor at Heidelberg, died when he was only thirty-eight years old. His *"Systema theologiæ"* was widely used. Heppe says of him that the height of the religious and philosophical speculation, and of the dialectic skill, of the German Reformed dogmatics is found in his system.

2) JOHANN ALSTED (d. 1638), who represented the Reformed Church of Nassau at the Synod of Dort, 1618, was a very prolific writer, and his works give a striking idea of the literary and scientific attainments of his age. The various theological disciplines were discussed by him in separate works, *"Theologia Scholastica didactica"* (1618), *"Theologia polemica"* (1620), *"Theol. prophetica,"* etc.

3) MARKUS FRIEDRICH WENDELIN (d. 1652) was one of the chief representatives of Reformed Scholasticism. In his *"Christianæ theologiæ systema majus,"* published after his death, in 1656, he pays a great deal of attention to the "absurdas Lutheranorum opiniones," and accuses them of Pelagianism.

b) Switzerland.

1) AMANDUS POLANUS (d. 1610) composed a *"Syntagma theol. Christ."* (1610), which was held in high repute. GASS says that Polanus gave the first example

of an elaboration of the doctrinal system, expounding and making distinctions in the causal method.

2) JOHANNES WOLLEB (d. 1629), professor of theology at Basel, 1618—29, published only one book, his *"Compendium theologiæ Christianæ,"* 1626, but it established his reputation as one of the great theologians of the Reformed Church. The work is noted for its clearness and precision and the perfect order of its arrangement.

3) BENEDICT PICTET (d. 1724), professor of theology at Geneva (1702—24), was an able and voluminous writer. His *"Theologia Christiana"* (1696, in 11 vols.) was much valued.

c) The Netherlands.

Among the Arminians we may mention the great divines Episcopius, Grotius, and Limborch.

1) SIMON EPISCOPIUS (d. 1643), professor of theology at Leyden (1611—18), at Amsterdam (1634—43), among other works wrote *"Institutiones Theologicæ"* and *"Responsio ad Quaestiones Theologicas,"* which became the standard works of Arminian theology.

2) HUGO GROTIUS (d. 1645) espoused the cause of the Arminians. In his *"Defensio fidei Catholicae de satisfactione Christi"* (1617), written to clear himself from the charge of Socinianism, he first propounded what is known as "the Governmental Theory of the Atonement." According to his view, the right to relax the demands of the law, at will, belongs to God's prerogative as moral governor. Christ's death was not a vicarious atonement, not a real satisfaction of the justice of God, but the *benevolence* of God requires, that, as a precondition of the forgiveness of any sinner, he should furnish such an *example* of suffering in Christ as will exhibit his determination that sin shall

not go unpunished. His apologetic work *"De veritate relig. christ."* (1627), designed for seamen who came in contact with Mohammedans and heathens, has been translated into many languages.

3) PHILIP VAN LIMBORCH (d. 1712), professor of theology at Amsterdam (1668—1712), completed the work which Episcopius began and Curcellæus (d. 1659) continued. His *"Institutiones Theologiae Christianae"*[1] (1686) is the most complete exposition of the Arminian doctrine extant, and is noted for its perspicuity and judicious selection of material.

Over against these defenders of Arminianism, in strict adherence to the praedestinarian views of Calvin, may be mentioned Gomarus, Maccovius, Maresius, and Voetius.

4) FRANCIS GOMARUS (d. 1641), professor of theology at Leyden, Saumur, and Gröningen, was the leader of the extreme Calvinistic party, and the declared adversary of Arminianism. He and his followers (the Gomarists) were Supralapsarians, i. e., they held that God not only foresaw and permitted, but actually *decreed* the fall of man, but overruled it for his redemption. His *"Loci theol."* appeared in 1644.

5) JOANNES MACCOVIUS (d. 1644), professor of theology at Franeker (1615—44), was famous as a disputant. In his *"Loci Communes"* (1626) he adopts the scholastic method of treatment.

6) SAMUEL MARESIUS (d. 1673), professor of theology at Gröningen (1643—77), wrote many polemical works (against the Amyraldists, the Socinians, the Jesuits, the Cartesians, the Federalists, etc.).

7) GYSBERTUS VOETIUS (d. 1676), professor of theology at Utrecht (1634—76), was a pupil of Gomarus,

[1] Translated into English by William Jones, London, 1702.

and a strict Calvinist both in doctrine and in policy. He regarded Arminianism as of the greatest danger to the Dutch Reformed Church, and waged war against it to the bitter end. He also strongly opposed the federalism of Cocceius and the philosophical views of Descartes.

The philosophical system of Descartes gave rise to violent controversies, and left its impress upon the doctrinal views of the Reformed Church, for the theologians who belonged to this school attempted to reconcile the principles of natural and revealed theology.

8) RENE DESCARTES (d. 1650, in Stockholm) was the great master of the system of philosophical rationalism. Starting from the principle *de omnibus est dubitandum,* Descartes arrived at his *cogito, ergo sum,* as the ultimate fact of consciousness which cannot be doubted. A most powerful opposition arose against him in the Church. Voetius, in 1639, charged him with Atheism, his philosophy was condemned in 1647 and again in 1676 by the university of Leyden, as well as by the Synod of Delft in 1657.

Over against its serious errors, the philosophy of Descartes has given to the world some fruitful truths. He established the authority of reason in its own sphere, and on the witness of consciousness he has constructed a barrier sufficiently strong to resist the efforts of skepticism and a narrow, false theology. Among other things he has shed special light on the idea of the infinite, and Deism may be said to have been philosophically annihilated by him.

The Federal Theology originated with Cocceius, and is represented by Burmann, Leydecker, Witsius, and Van Til.

9) JOHANNES COCCEIUS (d. 1669), professor of the-

ology at Bremen (1629), Franeker (1636), at Leyden (1650), was the founder of the Federal Theology.[1] His principal works, in which his views are developed, are his *"Summa Doctrinae"* (1648), and *"Summa Theologiae."* He drew his theology directly from the Bible, and from it alone; and thus he put himself in opposition to the scholastics and the Cartesians. But as an interpreter Cocceius is open to the charge of fancifulness. HEPPE says: "The fruit of his influence on the Reformed Dogmatics was to lead theologians back to the Bible, delivering it from the bondage of a traditional scholasticism."

10) FRANZ BURMANN (d. 1679), professor of theology at Utrecht (1662—79), in his *"Synopsis Theologiae"* (1671) attempts to reconcile the doctrines of Cocceius and those of the orthodox Reformed Church, and embodies the results of the Federal theology in a permanent form.

11) MELCHOIR LEYDECKER (d. 1721), professor of theology at Utrecht (1679—1721), simplified the Federal theology and treated the whole system of theology in the order of the three persons of the Trinity, approximating very closely to the Reformed dogmatics in its traditional form. He presents his system most fully in his *"De oeconomia trium personarum,"* etc. (1682).

12) HERMANN WITSIUS (d. 1708), professor of theology at Franeker (1675—80), Utrecht (1680—98), and Leyden (1698—1708), in his *De oeconomia foe-*

[1] His whole doctrinal system was founded upon the idea of a covenant between God and man. He distinguished between 1) the covenant before the fall (of works), and 2) the covenant after the fall (of grace). This latter he divides into three *economies:* 1) the economy prior to the law, 2) under the law, and 3) of the Gospel.

derum Dei cum hominibus"[1] endeavored to mediate between the orthodox Reformed and the Federalists, but as usual pleased neither party, least of all the Federalists, to whom he belonged, who accused him of sinning against the Holy Ghost. The work itself is in no way remarkable.

13) SOLOMON VAN TIL (d. 1713), professor of theology at Dort and Leyden, was one of the ablest of the Reformed divines. In his *'Theologiae utriusque compendium tum naturalis tum revelatae"* (1704), he endeavored to set forth a system which combined Scholasticism, Cartesianism, and Federalism.

d) England and Scotland.[2]

The Reformation in England ended by showing itself decidedly Calvinistic. Scotland, with the Presbyterian form of government, also received from JOHN KNOX the principles of Calvinism. The Church of England, during the beginning of the seventeenth century, was represented by RICHARD HOOKER, FIELD, JACKSON, and ARCHBISHOP LAUD, and during the latter half, by BULL, JEREMY TAYLOR, STILLINGFLEET, WATERLAND, BEVERIDGE, PEARSON, and BURNET. In the Established Church there were still some who held to the doctrines of the Reformed theology, such as LEIGHTON and ROBERT SOUTH. The more distinctive Puritan theology was advocated by CHARNOCK, JOHN BUNYAN, RICHARD BAXTER, JOHN OWEN, and JOHN HOWE. The Scotch divines as a rule, of whom me may mention Thomas Boston and the New England divines of this period, such as John Cotton and Cotton Mather, were strict Calvinists.

[1] English translation in 3 vols., one in 1765, and another in 1771. Last edition in 2 vols., London, 1837.

[2] Compare Hagenbach's *History of Doctrines*, edited by Henry B. Smith, Vol. 2, pp. 182—193. See also Perry's *History of the Church of England*, pp. 358—586, New York, 1880.

There were also other phases of theological opinion in England. A Platonizing tendency was represented by Ralph Cudworth, and under Latitudinarianism we may class such names as Chillingworth, Tillotson, and Samuel Clarke.

1) RICHARD HOOKER (d. 1600) was one of the most eminent divines of the Church of England. His *"Ecclesiastical Polity,*[1] more than any other work, has given shape to the theology of the English Church.

2) RICHARD FIELD (d. 1616) was an intimate friend of Hooker, and in his famous work *"Of the Church"*[2] treats of the nature, members, and government of the true Church. He takes the moderate view of the Episcopacy.

3) THOMAS JACKSON[3] (d. 1640) was originally a Calvinist, but became an Arminian.

4) WILLIAM LAUD[4] (beheaded 1644), archbishop of Canterbury, was the great High-Churchman of this period, and has been called the "English Cyprian."

5) GEORGE BULL (d. 1710), Bishop of St. David's, in his *"Defensio Fidei Nicenæ"*[5] (1685) in a most learned manner attempts to show that the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity existed fully developed in the Christian Church before the Council of Nicæa.

6) JEREMY TAYLOR (d. 1667), "the Chrysostom of English theology, but in brilliancy of imagination surpassing his Greek antitype,"[6] was decidedly anti-Calvinistic and anti-Puritan, and not altogether free from

[1] Best edition by KEBLE.
[2] Republished in 4 vols., Cambridge, 1847.
[3] His works, of which his *Commentaries on the Apostles' Creed* is the best, have been republished in 12 vols., Oxford, 1844.
[4] His works have been republished in 7 vols., Oxford, 1853.
[5] New translation in 2 vols., Oxford, 1851—52. Best edition of his works by Burton in 8 vols., Oxford, 1827, 1846.
[6] Stoughton in *Schaff-Herzog.*

Pelagianizing tendencies, but approximated very closely to the Lutheran doctrine of the Sacraments. He is best known, however, by his devotional works, such as *"Holy Living,"* and *"Holy Dying,"* and his *"Life of Christ."*

7) EDWARD STILLINGFLEET (d. 1699), Bishop of Worcester, an able metaphysician as well as theologian, was an ardent opponent to Romanism, and took an active interest in the Trinitarian controversy of the age.

8) DANIEL WATERLAND (d. 1740) was the bold defender of the orthodox doctrine against the Arians and Socinians of his time. Against the views of SAMUEL CLARKE he wrote his masterly works on *"Christ's Divinity."*[1]

9) WILLIAM BEVERIDGE[2] (d. 1708), Bishop of St. Asaph, has been styled "the great reviver and restorer of primitive piety." Among his works we may mention his *"Doctrine of the Church of England"* and his *"Thesaurus Theologicus."*

10) JOHN PEARSON (d. 1686), Bishop of Chester, was one of the great divines of the Church of England, and his great work *"Exposition of the Creed"*[3] is a standard to this day.

11) GILBERT BURNET (d. 1715), Bishop of Salisbury, mainly known for his historical labors, wrote his *"Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles"* in 1699.

12) ROBERT LEIGHTON (d. 1684), principal of the University of Edinburgh, Bishop of Dunblane (1661—72), Archbishop of Glasgow (1672—74), was one of the noblest characters of his day.

13) ROBERT SOUTH (d.1716) was a strong Calvinist, and though anti-Puritan in civil and ecclesiastical pol-

[1] His works appeared in a new edition, in 6 vols., 1843.
[2] His works were republished, in 12 vols., Oxford, 1844—48.
[3] Best edition that of CHEVALLIER.

ity, was a Puritan in theology. As a preacher few in the English Church have ever excelled him. His mastery of English is almost unrivalled.

14) STEPHEN CHARNOCK (d. 1680) is best known by his able "*Discourses on the Existence and Attributes of God,*" a work which is an acknowledged masterpiece.

15) JOHN BUNYAN (d. 1688), a Baptist, through his immortal work, the "*Pilgrim's Progress*", has aided greatly in spreading evangelical truths among the lowly and ignorant. COLERIDGE regards this book as "incomparably the best *Summa Theologiæ Evangelicæ* ever produced by a writer not miraculously inspired." Its style is invaluable as a study to every person who wishes to obtain a wide command of the English language.

16) RICHARD BAXTER (d. 1691) was noted as a preacher, a pastor, a teacher, and a theologian. Inclined to Calvinism, he was nevertheless independent in his theological views. He sought to find a common platform upon which all could meet—Calvinist and Arminian, Episcopalian and Presbyterian, Protestant and Romanist. A most voluminous writer, Baxter is mainly known by his "*Saints' Everlasting Rest,*" which is only readable in an abridgment of an abridgment. His chief work was his "*Methodus Theologiae Christianæ,*" a Latin work of nine hundred folio pages, published in 1681.

17) JOHN OWEN[1] (d. 1683) was the most eminent of the Independent divines of this period. He was a strong Calvinist, and has written on almost all theological topics.

18) JOHN HOWE (d. 1705), one of Cromwell's chap-

[1] Latest edition of his works in 17 vols., Phila., 1865—69.

lains, through his various works has left an impress on Puritan theology. ROBERT HALL: "I have learned more from John Howe than any author I ever read."

19) THOMAS BOSTON[1] (d. 1732) exercised a great influence over the Presbyterian churches in Scotland and England. He is best known by his *"Complete Body of Divinity,"* and his *"Fourfold State."*

20) JOHN COTTON (d. at Boston, 1652), was a voluminous writer[2], and one of the most noted of the Puritans in America.

21) COTTON MATHER (d. 1728) is the author of three hundred and eighty-two separate works, of which several are elaborate volumes, while the great work of his life (in his own view), his *Biblia Americana,* still remains in manuscript.

22) RALPH CUDWORTH (d. 1688), an English Platonist, occupied an intermediate position between the Puritanic and Romanizing tendencies of his time, and was an able champion of revealed religion against the reigning Deism. His fame rests on his great work *"The True Intellectual System of the Universe."*[3]

23) WILLIAM CHILLINGWORTH (d. 1644) is best known by his famous work *"The Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation,"* which is an able vindication of Protestantism. "The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, is the religion of Protestants."

24) JOHN TILLOTSON (d. 1694), Archbishop of Canterbury, was a Latitudinarian in his tendencies, being influenced partly by the writings of Chillingworth. He

[1] Collected edition of his works in 12 vols., London, 1852.

[2] Dexter in his *Congregationalism, as seen in its Literature,* mentions 36 of his publications.

[3] The occasion of its appearance was the philosophy of Hobbes (1588—1679).

ranks among the foremost of English preachers, and was strongly opposed to popery.

25) SAMUEL CLARKE (d. 1729) was a philosopher as well as theologian, and defended the Newtonian philosophy against Leibnitz. His fame chiefly rests upon his *"Discourse upon the Being and Attributes of God,"* and his *"Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity."* This last work exposed him to the charge of Arianism.

e) France.

The French school of Amyraldists was preceded in certain respects by Cameron, as Amyraut was his pupil. Its great opponent was Heidegger. The doctrine was renewed by Pajon and Papin.

1) JOHN CAMERON (d. 1625), professor of theology at Saumur (1618) and at Montauban (1624), taught the imputation of Christ's passive obedience alone, and advocated the theory of what is known as "hypothetic universalism," which was more fully developed by his pupil Amyraut. He was not an Arminian, however, as is shown by his *"Defensio de gratia et libero arbitrio"* (1624).

2) MOSES AMYRAUT (Amyraldus) (d. 1664), professor of theology at Saumur (1633—64), in his *"Traite de la Predestination"* expounded the doctrines of grace and predestination not in accordance with the formulas of the Synod of Dort. His views have been described as "the combination of a real particularism with a merely ideal universalism." The *Formula Consensus* was drawn up against his views in Geneva, 1675.

3) JOHANN HEINRICH HEIDEGGER (d. 1698), professor of theology at Heidelberg, Steinfurt (1659), and Zurich (1665), was the great opponent of Amyraldism. He drew up the *Formula Consensus* which was adopted

by the city of Zurich in 1675. His *"Corpus Theologiae Christianae"* was often reprinted.

4) CLAUDE PAJON (d. 1685), for a short time professor of theology at Saumur, is the father of the so-called *Pajonism,* a peculiar development of the doctrinal system of the French Reformed Church. A follower of Amyraldus, he denied the immediate concurrence in providence, and the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit in conversion.

5) ISAAC PAPIN (d. 1709), a pupil of Pajon, departed more and more from the Reformed doctrines, and finally embraced Romanism, in 1690.

§ 19. The Dogmatics of the Period of Transition.

The dogmatics of this period shows partly a reactionary character over against the traditionalism and formalism which, in a certain measure, pervaded Theology, and partly a progressive character in which were conflicting elements,—the one of which tended to a better life, the other toward rationalistic apostasy.

1. *The Dogmatics of Pietism.*[1]

Pietism denotes a movement in the Lutheran Church which arose as a reaction of the living, practical faith against a dead orthodoxy. It grew from the very principles of the Lutheran Reformation, and would, no doubt, have developed, even though there had been no dead orthodoxy to react upon.

1) JOHANN VALENTIN ANDREÆ (d. 1654), a grandson of Jacob Andreæ (d. 1590) had already waged a polemic against the scholasticism and dogmatism of the

[1] See H. Schmid: *Geschichte des Pietismus.* Nördlingen, 1863; A. Ritschl: *Geschichte des Pietismus,* 2 vols., Bonn, 1880—1884.

Lutheran theology of his time, but in the seventeenth century we have only to do with Pietism in its early stage, and the whole movement centres around the person of Spener.

2) PHILIP JACOB SPENER (d. 1705) was one of the purest and most spotless in character of the theologians of the seventeenth century.[1] In theological culture he

[1] During his university course, at Strasburg, he lived a very retired life, devoting himself entirely to his books. His theological teachers were principally Dannhauer, Johann and Sebastian Schmid, the last named being the most famous exegete of his day. According to the custom of the times he completed his studies by visiting the different universities. He first went to Basel to receive instruction of the younger Buxtorf, at that time the most celebrated teacher of Hebrew on the Continent. Afterwards he spent a year at Geneva, and also five months in Stuttgart and Tuebingen, and his qualities of mind and heart gained him many friends in Wuertemberg. In 1666, although only thirty-one years of age, on account of his distinguished talents and rare learning, which was profound, thorough, and comprehensive, extending even beyond the sphere of theology and philosophy, he was chosen senior pastor in Frankfurt-am-Main.

Although most heartily attached to the Lutheran Church, he believed that in adhering to its then prevalent orthodoxy, it had departed from the earnest, lively Gospel of the Reformers, and was in danger of burying its talent in a sterile theology of words and dead orthodoxy. He aimed at a reform, and this should consist in an inner, living theology of the heart, and a demonstration thereof in true piety of life. He first of all attempted to revive a thorough system of catechetical instruction, and especially attacked the system of mechanical memorizing, which was then as common as now. In 1670, after he had been four years in Frankfurt, he invited to a kind of friendly re-union in his study, for the purpose of mutual edification, the most serious-minded persons in his congregation, and thus constituted the so-called *collegia pietatis*. In 1682, twelve years later, Spener was able to change his private meetings into public gatherings, and transfer them from the study to the church.

In the meantime he had published (1675) his famous *Pia Desideria*, in which he laments the corruption of the Church, and he recommends six different remedies. These remedies were: 1) The spreading of a more general and more intimate acquaintance with the Bible, by means of private gatherings; 2) Laying more stress upon the universal priesthood of believers, and using the co-operation of laymen in the spiritual guidance of the congregation; 3) Emphasizing the fact that a knowledge of Christianity must be accompanied by a corresponding Christian practice, in order

was equal to any of his contemporaries. It was his principle to submit to the Confessions of the Church, and even Calovius himself, the great champion of orthodoxy, acknowledged that he found nothing heterodox in Spener. And such, indeed, is the case, for he is in perfect harmony and accord with the greatest theologian of them all, Johann Gerhard.

It was Spener who gave character to Pietism in its first stages, but he cannot be called the father of Pietism as it was developed later at Halle and elsewhere.

In the department of Dogmatics, the Pietistic School originated very little. Though Spener's list of works embraces seven volumes folio, sixty-three in quarto, seven in octavo, and forty-six in duodecimo, still they are mainly practical.

3) JOACHIM JUSTUS BREITHAUPT (d. 1732), profes-

to be of any value; 4) Instead of attacking heretics and infidels with merely doctrinal and generally more or less embittered polemics, we should use love as our motive power; 5) A reorganization of theological study, so as to make a godly life as important a part of the preparation for ministerial work, as study and learning; 6) A new manner of preaching,—a return to the earnest method of Apostolic times.

This work of Spener found an echo in many hearts in Germany, and Spener ever afterwards adhered to these propositions, and defended them against all attacks.

The first opposition to Spener came from the university of Leipsic, under the leadership of Johann Benedict Carpzov and Alberti, which was aggravated by the founding of the new university at Halle, which immediately became the home of Pietism, and was thronged by crowds of students. It was at Halle that Francke, Breithaupt, and Anton, as members of the theological faculty, exerted such a wide influence as the later leaders of the pietistic movement.

The Pietistic controversy, in contrast with the thorough theological discussions of previous decades, was entirely of a personal and bitter character, and the opponents of Spener do not appear to a good advange. DEUTSCHMANN, the senior of the Faculty of Wittenberg, did more harm than good to his cause, when in his *Christlutherische Vorstellung* (1695) he accused Spener of two hundred and eighty-three heresies. All these accusations, and the various other polemical writings, Spener answered in a becoming spirit, and in 1705 he peacefully entered into his final rest.

sor of theology at Halle (1691—1704), where together with Francke and Anton he gave the whole theological study its peculiar character and tendency, published *"Institutiones Theologicæ,"*[1] and *"Theses credendorum et agendorum fundamentales"* (1700). The lectures of *Paul Anton* (d. 1730) *"Collegium Antitheticum,"* based on the *"Theses"* of Breithaupt, were published after his death in 1732.

4) JOHANN ANASTASIUS FREYLINGHAUSEN[2] (d. 1739) was also one of the leaders of the Pietistic movement in Germany, and succeeded August Hermann Francke (d. 1727), the founder of the Orphan House at Halle, in 1727. His principal theological work, *"Grundlegung der Theologie"* (1703), is noted for its piety and practical tendency, in opposition to the dry and cold scholasticism which then prevailed in the German universities.

5) JOHANN JACOB RAMBACH (d. 1735), professor of theology at Halle and Giessen, exercised a considerable influence as a mediator between Pietism and the Wolffian philosophy. His *"Schriftmässige Erklärung der Grundlegung der Theologie"* was published by Freylinghausen in 1738.

6) JOACHIM LANGE (d. 1744) professor of theology at Halle after 1709, was the literary representative of the Pietists. In his controversy with the orthodox Church, in which Lange acted as spokesman of the Pietists, he was far from being a match for VALENTIN ERNST LÖSCHER (d. 1749), the acknowledged leader of

[1] 2 vols., Halle, 1694; much enlarged, 3 vols., 1732.

[2] His most valuable productions are 44 hymns. He also published one of the best German Hymn Books, 2 vols., Halle, 1704 and 1713. The historical significance of this collection consists in its pietistic spirit, and the introduction of the element of subjective devotion as a supplement to the older, more objective and churchly hymns of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

the orthodox party, the author of *"Timotheus Verinus,"* of which the first part appeared in 1718, and the second in 1722. Löscher accused the Pietists of being indifferent to the truths of revelation systematized in the symbolical books, of depreciating the sacraments and the ministerial office, of obscuring the doctrine of justification by faith by asserting that good works were necessarily connected with saving faith, its evidence, indeed,—and he altogether rejected the chiliastic, terministic, and perfectionistic doctrines which had developed among the Pietists.[1] In almost every point there was some reason for the opposition of Löscher, and he was not a mere dogmatist; on the contrary, he advocated the cause of practical piety almost with as much warmth as Pietists themselves.

Nevertheless, the fundamental ideas of Spener and his followers were too intimately related to the very principles of the Reformation, not to find a wide acceptance. In less than half a century Pietism spread its influence through all spheres of life, and through all classes of society; and though it had to give way, in Northern Germany, to the rising rationalism, it found a new home in Southern Germany. What Spener, Francke, Anton, Breithaupt, Arnold, and others had been to Prussia and Saxony, Bengel, Weismann, Oetinger, Hahn and others were to Wuertemberg and Baden.

To the period of the later Pietism belong three tendencies which stand in part in a reciprocal operation with it. These are the Biblical, the Historical, and the Philosophical tendencies.

2. *The Biblical Tendency.*

This tendency has its home by pre-eminence in Wuertemberg. Among its most prominent represen-

[1] See Riggenbach in *Schaff-Herzog* under *Pietism.*

tatives we may mention Bengel, Crusius, Oetinger, Rieger, and Roos.

1) JOHANN ALBRECHT BENGEL[1] (d. 1752), by the publication of his *"Greek Testament"* and an *"Apparatus Criticus"* (1734), laid the foundation for the science of Textual Criticism. His famous *canon* was, "The more difficult reading is to be preferred." This work was followed by his *"Gnomon Novi Testamenti"*[2] (1742), which remains to this day "a treasure house of exposition delivered in sentences whose point, clearness, brevity, and wondrous depth of meaning, render them not only worthy of patient study, but a part of the mental stores of the attentive student." His main principle of interpretation was "to put nothing *into* the Scriptures, but to draw everything *from* them, and suffer nothing to remain hidden that is really *in* them." His motto was: *Te totum applica ad textum; rem totam applica ad te.* With a profound reverence for the Bible, with an acuteness which let nothing escape him, and in strict conformity to grammatical rules, but untrammeled by dogmatical or symbolical considerations, he sought to find out the exact meaning of the Scripture. His exegetical principles left their impress upon his dogmatic system (for in theology he was but a moderate Lutheran), and this displays itself most fully in his views of the historical development of the kingdom of God, and in his realistic interpretation of the Book of Revelation.

2) CHRITIAN AUGUST CRUSIUS (d. 1775), professor of theology at Leipsic (1750—75), was the staunch

[1] Compare Burk: *Memoir of Life and Writings of John Albert Bengel*, from the German, London, 1837; Wächter: *J. A. Bengel's Lebensabriss*, Stuttgart, 1865.

[2] Best English edition by Blackley and Hawes, with Introduction by Dr. Weidner. 3 vols. Fleming H. Revell Co.

adversary of the Wolffian philosophy, and in theology he defended the tradition of the Church, as an element in true exegesis, against Ernesti, whose exegetical principle admitted only a purely grammatical interpretation. The views of Crusius are most fully presented in his *"Hypomnemata ad theolgoiam propheticam."*[1]

3) FRIEDRICH CHRISTOPH OETINGER[2] (d. 1782), the great Swabian theosophist of the eighteenth century, exercised a great influence in the pietistic circles of Würtemberg. Bengel, with whom he corresponded, became his ideal in theology, Boehme in philosophy, and at a later time, Swedenborg. He sought to construct a sacred philosophy, and to find out by investigation the original, living essence of truth, by studying the two Bibles,—nature, and the Word of God. All efforts to separate him from the Lutheran Church proved unavailing, and in his old age he said that his entire theology was concentrated in Luther's Catechism. In Würtemberg he had many followers, and he exerted great influence over Schelling and von Baader. The peasant Michael Hahn was one of his most remarkable followers, and diffused his doctrines amongst the people.[3]

4) GEORGE CONRAD RIEGER (d. 1743) was one of the most celebrated preachers of the pietistic school, and his sermons are still much read in Würtemberg.

5) MAGNUS FRIEDRICH ROOS (d. 1803) was a pupil of Bengel, and exercised great influence not only by his

[1] *Part I.* General Introduction, 1764; *Part II.* On select passages, 1771; *Part III.* On Isaiah, 1779. See also Franz Delitzsch: *Die biblisch-proph. Theologie, ihre Fortbildung durch Crusius, etc.* Leipsic, 1845.

[2] Compare his *Selbstbiographie*, edited by Hamburger, Stuttgart, 1845; also Auberlen: *"Oetinger's Theosophie nach ihren Grundsaetzen,"* Tuebingen, 1847.

[3] See Auberlen in *Schaff-Herzog.*

writings, but also by his magnetic personality. His *"Christliche Glaubenslehre"* is still much read in Würtemberg (last edition 1860).

3. *The Historical Tendency.*

Out of the conflicts between the orthodox and pietistic school arose what may be called the historical school. The theologians of this school sought to unite Lutheran orthodoxy with free investigation, true scholarship with religious fervor, strict confessionalism with an irenic spirit. Among the most important theologians of this tendency we may mention Buddeus, Pfaff, Walch, and Mosheim. Three others, also belonging to this school, Ernesti, Michaelis, and Semler, though still believing in a divine revelation, nevertheless by their principles of interpretation prepared the way for the admission of Rationalism into theology.

1) JOHANN FRANZ BUDDEUS (d. 1729), professor of theology at Jena after 1705, was a man of genuine piety and immense learning. He sought to harmonize orthodoxy and pietism. He was distinguished for his fidelity to the faith of the Church, and for his firmness and moderation towards those that dissented from it. He wrote more than a hundred books, some of which are still acknowledged authorities. Especially important are his *"Institutiones theol. dogm."* (1723), *"Instit. theol. moralis"* (1711), and *"Isagoge hist. ad theol. universam"* (1727).

2) CHRISTOF MATTHAEUS PFAFF (d. 1760), professor of theology at Tübingen (1714—56), and at Giessen (1756—60), was a man of great accomplishments and exercised a large influence as a teacher. He was very active in promoting a union between the Reformed and Lutheran Churches, and his doctrinal standpoint was

more liberal than the prevailing orthodoxy, as is evident from his *"Institutiones theologiae"* (1719).

3) JOHANN GEORG WALCH (d. 1775), professor of theology at Jena after 1724, took an active part in the philosophical controversy between Buddeus and Wolff, and in his *"Philosophisches Lexicon"* departs from Lutheran orthodoxy, opening the way on one side to pietism, and on the other for rationalism.[1]

4) JOHANN LORENZ VON MOSHEIM (d. 1755), professor of theology at Helmstädt (1723—47), and at Göttingen (1747—54), was the most learned theologian of the Lutheran Church of his day. As a theologian he was opposed to the confessional orthodoxy on the ground that theology would thus be excluded from scientific culture. Mosheim made contributions to nearly every branch of theological science, but is best known by his works in the department of Church History.

5) JOHANN AUGUST ERNESTI (d. 1781), professor of theology at Leipsic after 1758, enjoyed great fame as a classical philologist, and in his *"Institutio Interpretis N. T."*[2] (1761) applied the same principles of interpretation to the exposition of the Holy Scriptures, thus founding the grammatico-historical school of interpretation. Though Ernesti held to the doctrines of the Church and believed in inspiration, still he has rightly been called the father of rationalistic exegesis, and his principles undermined the old dogmatical method of interpretation.

[1] The principal works of Walch are 1) *Einleitung in die Religionsstreitigkeiten ausser der evang. luth. Kirche* (5 vols., 1733—36); 2) *Einleitung, etc., innerhalb der evang. luth. Kirche* (5 vols., 1730—39); and an edition of *Luther's Works*, in 24 vols., Halle, 1740—52.

[2] Translated into English and published in the *Biblical Cabinet*. Edinburgh, 1834.

5) JOHANN DAVID MICHAELIS (d. 1791), professor of theology at Göttingen after 1745, bore the same relation to the Old Testament as Ernesti did to the New, and was by no means a pillar for the waning orthodoxy of the times, for in theology he departed widely from the Lutheran orthodoxy, and openly acknowledged that he knew nothing of the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit. His *"Commentaries on the Laws of Moses"* (4 vols., London, 1810), and his *"Introduction to the New Testament"* (6 vols., London, 1823), have been translated into English. KURTZ: "No man was a greater master than he in the art of substituting his own empty, superficial, and conceited views for those of the sacred authors, and then to explain them at great length. His 'Commentaries on the Laws of Moses' is a classic in this respect."

7) JOHANN SOLOMO SEMLER[1] (1791), professor of theology at Halle after 1757, was a forerunner to Rationalism in a still greater degree than Ernesti and Michaelis. Endowed with great gifts, but without any depth of spiritual character, he undermined the pillars of orthodoxy, without wishing to touch Christianity itself, by disputing the genuineness of certain books of the Bible, by laying down a peculiar theory of inspiration and accommodation to the peculiar views of the New Testament times, which allowed error and delusion in Scripture, and by treating the history of dogmatics in such a way as if the doctrines of the Church were the result of misconception, and want of judgment. He wrote one hundred and seventy separate works, only two of which, however, reached a second edition. He sowed the wind and reaped a whirlwind, and when the storm of rationalism began to rage, Semler died of a broken heart.

[1] See H. Schmid: *Die Theologie Semlers*, Nördlingen, 1858.

4. *The Philosophical Tendency.*

This tendency had its origin mainly in Wolff. The great stimulating minds of philosophy had been Descartes, Spinoza, and Leibnitz. Wolff developed and methodized the system of Leibnitz. Theological representatives of the philosophical tendency are Reinbeck, S. J. Baumgarten and Toellner.

The philosophy of DESCARTES (1596—1650) is neither a Catholic nor a Protestant philosophy, and gave rise to two tendencies, the one pantheistic, the other theistic. It was SPINOZA (1632—77) who transformed the dualism of Descartes into pantheism, whose fundamental conception was the unity of substance. He has greatly impressed himself upon much of the subtlest speculation of our century. Fichte, Schelling, Schleiermacher, Hegel, and many others, owe very much to him. In fact, Spinoza has largely contributed to the various phases of pantheism so current in our day, and his influence upon our own time is larger than upon his own.

The immortal LEIBNITZ (1646—1716), the father of German philosophy, at once one of the most independent thinkers and one of the profoundest scholars of his age, and of all time, exerted a great influence upon the theology and general culture of the eighteenth century, chiefly through his famous *"Theodicy"* (1710) in which he attempted to demonstrate the agreement of reason with faith, and to vindicate God in view of the evil in the world, maintaining that there is a harmony between the kingdom of nature and grace. His philosophy was theistic and was directed pre-eminently toward the union of the theological and cosmological conceptions of the world.

CHRISTIAN WOLFF (1679—1754), adopting the the-

ories of Leibnitz, modifying them partly with ideas derived from Aristotle, so systematized them, and provided them with demonstrations, that he founded a comprehensive system of philosophy. This was done with such talent and ability, that nearly all the disciples of Leibnitz in Germany were influenced by him, and the school was and still is designated as the Leibnitz-Wolffian. This philosophy became more and more prevalent and opened the way for the theological Rationalism, which was afterwards more fully developed by Kant and his school.

The earlier followers of Wolff remained faithful to the doctrine of the Church. JOH. GUST. REINBECK (1682—1741) prefixed to his reflections on the truths contained in the Augsburg Confession a preface on the use of reason and philosophy in theology. SIGMUND JACOB BAUMGARTEN (1706—1757), professor of theology at Halle after 1730, exerted a wide influence as a teacher. By adopting the formal scheme of the philosophy of Wolff, and applying it to the theological ideas of Pietism, he formed the transition from the pietism of Spener and Francke to the modern rationalism. But is was especially JOHANN GOTTL. TÖLLNER (d. 1774) who first opened the way for the introduction of Rationalism into dogmatic theology. He taught "that God leads man to happiness already by natural revelation," and that the revelation of Scripture is only a more certain and perfect means thereto. He also found no trace of inspiration in the Bible, since the sacred authors thought and wrote without any special divine aid.

5. *The History of Dogmatics outside of Germany.*

This is the best place to present a brief outline of the history of theology outside of Germany during the eighteenth century. On the whole, nearly all the Prot-

estant countries took very little notice of the conflicts going on there. In England the principles of Arianism were taught by SAMUEL CLARKE (d. 1729), and the Unitarian controversy was continued by JOSEPH PRIESTLEY (d. 1804, having come to the United States in 1794), whose great opponent, SAMUEL HORSLEY (d. 1806), was more than a match for him, "his spear having pierced the Socinian's shield," as Gibbon expresses it.

Among the more prominent dogmatic writers of the Church of England we may mention DANIEL WATERLAND[1] (d. 1740), THOMAS STACKHOUSE[2] (d. 1752), THOMAS SECKER (d. 1768), AUGUSTUS MONTAGUE TOPLADY (d. 1778), WILLIAM WARBURTON[3] (d. 1779), JONES OF NAYLAND (d. 1800), and GEORGE TOMLINE[4] (d. 1827). Among the Baptists JOHN GILL[5] (d. 1771) takes the highest rank.

Of the three new sects[6] that originated in the eighteenth century, by far the most powerful and influential took its rise in England. JOHN WESLEY (d. 1791) and JOHN WILLIAM FLETCHER (d. 1785) laid the foundation of Wesleyan Arminianism, while GEORGE WHITE-

[1] The bold defender of the Church Doctrine against the Arians and Socinians of his time. See p. 224.

[2] His "Complete Body of Divinity" (1729) reached a third edition in 1755.

[3] His famous work "The Divine Legation of Moses" was written against the Deists.

[4] His "Elements of Christian Theology" (2 vols., London, 1799; 14th ed., 1843) is one of the standard works of theology in the Church of England.

[5] In his "Body of Divinity" (2 vols., 1769; new ed., London, 1839), he takes a strong Calvinistic ground, but is violently opposed to Infant Baptism.

[6] Methodism founded by JOHN WESLEY, the Unitas Fratrum or Moravians, resuscitated by COUNT ZINZENDORF (d. at Herrnhut, 1760), and the New Jerusalem Church founded by EMANUEL SWEDENBORG (d. 1772).

FIELD (d. 1770) became the father of the Welsh or Calvinistic branch of Methodism.

Of the theologians of the eighteenth century no one was superior to JONATHAN EDWARDS (d. 1758), the most distinguished divine of America, who was the great defender of Calvinism against all the objections raised by Arminianism, and the founder of the so-called "New England Theology."

§ 20. The Dogmatics of Rationalism and Supranaturalism.

This was a period in which there seemed to be a life struggle between the revealed testimony of God and the self-asserting Rationalism of man. In it the defence of truth was impaired by the unconscious demoralization of the spirit of the times in the very men who attempted to represent and defend the truth.

1. *The Illumination falsely so-called.*[1]

1) *In England.*

Deism flourished in England during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and was an indirect product of the tendencies at work within the Church of England. Deism has been defined as the exaltation of Natural Religion, so as to make it the normal rule of all positive religion.

Eminent in this school was Lord HERBERT OF CHERBURY (d. 1648), who was free from the usual levity of the Deists and attempted with serious earnestness, and

[1] Compare Lechler: *Geschichte des engl. Deismus*, Stuttgart, 1841; Farrar: *Critical History of Free Thought*, New York, 1881; Hurst: *History of Rationalism*, ninth revised edition, New York; Cairns: *Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century*, Edinburgh, 1881.

as he thought for the glory of God, in his two principal works, *De Veritate* (1624) and *De religione Gentilium* (1645), to show that natural religion is the heart of all religions and sufficient for salvation without Revelation.

The tendency of Herbert was developed with considerable ability and with marked effect by a number of Deistical writers, among whom were ANTHONY COLLINS (1729), MATTHEW TINDAL (d. 1733), called the "Great Apostle of Deism," whose chief work, *"Christianity as Old as the Creation* (1730), may be called the Deist's Primer, Lord BOLINGBROKE (d. 1751), DAVID HUME (d. 1776), and others of the same school.

The general position of this school was that the Bible was full of absurdities and of statements and principles conflicting with morality, — that the traditional Christianity of the Church was for the most part a work either of weak or hypocritical men.

2) *In France.*

In France JEAN JACQUES ROUESSEAU (d. 1778), appeared, writing in a charming style, demanding a return to nature in all the relations of life. His works present the dream of a poet. The Christianity he acknowledges is mere natural religion, and this kind of Christianity he defends with great ardor in his *"Profession de Foi du Vicaire Savoyard,"* in *"Emile."*

VOLTAIRE (d. 1778) has not the refinement of feeling nor the delicacy of style which characterize Rousseau. He shows a personal hatred to Christ, and with his poisonous satire attempts to render ridiculous the Holy Scriptures. These two great writers and their imitators controlled educated France. What they still left of the general religious ideas of men, belief in God, recognition of a realm of truth and virtue, was thrown

to the winds by the Materialism which followed them. These older infidels became by comparison almost relatively orthodox. The leaders of the coarser infidelity were DIDEROT (d. 1784), D'ALEMBERT (d. 1783), HELVETIUS (d. 1771), and others.

3) *In Germany.*

The witty frivolity of the French found a lodgment in the Court of FREDERICK II. of Germany (King of Prussia 1740—1786), and through the influence of the court more and more exercised a baneful influence upon the people. The watchword of the time, in all spheres of thought, was the word "Illumination," and the centre or focus of this light was Berlin.

4) *The development in Theology.*

While this movement was taking place in the outside world, a development in theology correspondent with it, took place. Among the perverters of truth two names are conspicuous, first, the frivolous Bahrdt, and the other, the more earnest but no less negative Reimarus.

BAHRDT (d. 1792) was a man of no ordinary talent, and full of activity. He wrote about 126 books, but a mere trifler in science, a man lewd in life, passing over first from Crusius to Ernesti, seeking to do away with the doctrines of the Church, under pretense of developing a Biblical system (*"Dogmatics,"* 1768). Subsequently, advancing still further, he tried to show that Scripture itself can be of no use in the establishment of right faith (*"Newest Revelations,"* 1772), and finally went over completely on the side of those who acknowledge nothing but Natural Religion (*"Moral Religion,"* 1787). He made morality the basis of all religion, and offered himself, the most immoral of men, as teacher of Morals to mankind.

REIMARUS (d. 1768) first appeared as a defender of the doctrine of the existence and attributes of God, from the wise constitution of nature. An assailant of Atheism and Spinozism, he subsequently introduced English Deism into Germany by means of a work published after his death by Lessing,—the famous *"Wolfenbüttel Fragments"* (1774—78), which claim to be an apology for the rationalistic worship of God. In this work Reimarus attempted to show the irrationality and immorality of a large portion of Scripture and of Biblical characters, and the contradiction especially in the narratives of the Evangelists.

These attacks upon revealed Religion were met indeed and answered, nevertheless the thought which lay at the bottom of this movement,—the reduction of revealed religion to the standard of nature,—constantly gained ground. This was partly due to the influence of the so-called *popular philosophy,* into which the philosophy of Wolff had run out, a philosophy in which the lighter tone of conversation had taken the place of that of the heavy mathematical demonstration. MENDELSSOHN (d. 1786) and others represented this philosophy.

Over against this intellectual tendency, the feeble supporters of the position of the older Church knew no better way than to make concessions. These professed defenders of orthodoxy talked much of the bonds which held together reason and faith, and the result was that illogical mixed theology, which was neither rationalistic nor orthodox,—too rationalistic to be orthodox, too orthodox to be rationalistic, and was thus at once neither and both. LESSING (d. 1781) hated it so thoroughly that he declared that the old orthodoxy would be far more acceptable than this mongrel system.

Among the representatives of this enfeebling of the Church doctrine may be mentioned SEILER (d. 1807), DÖDERLEIN (d. 1789), MORUS (d. 1792), GRUNER (d. 1778), and TELLER (d. 1804).

This whole effort to render the Christian doctrine more rational obtained a fixed principle through the labors of Kant.

2. *Kant.*

Among the greatest names in modern philosophy is that of IMMANUEL KANT[1] (d. 1804). His influence has been felt in every department of thought, and for a time at least was a special power in the domain of theology. He reasoned out from a critique of the faculty of cognition, and deduced from it the conceptions of space and time, the categories of the understanding, the ideas of reason, which he maintained are purely subjective and afforded no objective certainty. He maintained that we cannot demonstrate the existence of God,—that the ordinary proofs of it are untenable. Pure reason can make no affirmation in regard to God. These views he maintained in his *"Critique of Pure Reason"* (1781).

On the other hand, according to him, God is a postulate of the Practical Reason. Man as a theorizer can reach no conception of God, but man as a being of moral activity is driven to a recognition of a Supreme Being. Conscience demands unconditional recognition of the moral law of God. But with the world of virtue, the world of impulse, desire and passion is in conflict, and yet is equally essential to it; we cannot remove the

[1] The best single work for an introductory study of Kant's Philosophy is: *The Philosophy of Kant*, as contained in extracts from his own writings. Selected and translated by JOHN WATSON, 1891.

dissonance of the two worlds by destroying either. This conflict demands a harmonizing, which will be brought about by God, after death. The essential substance of religion he upholds to be 1) God, 2) virtue, 3) immortality. These principles he develops in his work, *"Religion within the bounds of Mere Reason"* (1793). In accordance with these principles we are to form our judgment of every form of religion and by them are to vindicate the pre-eminence of Christianity.

In these views Kant gave expression to the dominant tendency of his time, and although his views were of a decidedly Pelagian character, they yet gave rise to a relatively greater moral earnestness.

3. *Vulgar Rationalism.*

The vulgar Rationalism was the product of these two elements, the illumination on the one side, the Kantian philosophy on the other, meeting and fusing in the sphere of theology. Its essence has been defined to be the union of the deistic religion of Reason, with positive Protestantism. It proposed to reform Christianity in accordance with the wants of the time and the demand of what was then passing for reason. It was not so much a set of doctrines, or even of negations, as a method of interpretation; it fixed the reason of men as the absolute standard, adjusted revelation by it and forced the text to accord with what it assumed to be true.

In the Rationalism of the Eighteenth Century all the faith was submitted to the dominant culture of the times. The spurious illumination of the age determined the position of Scripture, of the doctrine of the Church, and of revelation in general. On the question of the necessity of revelation, in the strict sense of the word,

Rationalism really made the same decision as Deism, that is, it denied revelation in the strict sense, and the revelation it seemed to grant and to patronize was a figment of its own, at least the result of a mere ordinary providence, with nothing supernatural in it.

The dogmaticians of this tendency appeared with more or less closeness to Kant. Among these we may mention TIEFTRUNK (professor of philosophy at Halle, d. 1837), HENKE (professor of theology at Helmstädt, 1780—1809), STAUDLIN (professor of theology at Göttingen, 1790—1826), RÖHR (court-preacher at Weimar, 1820—1848), and WEGSCHEIDER (professor of theology at Halle, 1810—1849).

Wegscheider was the chief dogmatician of Rationalism.[1] His views are in brief thèse: Christ is a man, who obtained for himself the just claims to the title of the Son of God. His death is a symbol of the fact that sacrifices are abrogated, but is not to be abused as a plaster for the conscience of bad and morally corrupt men. God is no blood-thirsty Moloch, and all the sinner needs is the reformation of his life. The resurrection of Christ is the resuscitation from seeming death, a distinguished proof of the existence of divine providence. The ascension of Christ is a tradition, like that of Romulus and others. The righteousness before God is obtained, not by outward works, but neither is it obtained by mere faith, but through the gracious state of feeling which pleases God. This is possible, for original sin is a gloomy figment. The operation of the Word is a natural one. There is no such thing as a supernatural operation of Spirit in man. Reformation is a work of personal activity, the Sacraments are mere symbols. Baptism is a rite of consecration

[1] See his Instit. theol. Christ. dogm., 1815. 8th edition, 1844.

and initiation, and the Lord's Supper is a memorial meal. The doctrine concerning "the Last Things" reduces itself to faith in a future state of rewards.

This, says Luthardt, is the Dogmatics of Rationalism. Others attempted to approximate somewhat more closely the doctrine of the Church, without, however, abandoning the rationalistic basis. Such were AMMON (1766—1850), BRETSCHNEIDER (1776—1848), and TZSCHIRNER (professor of theology at Leipsic, d. 1828). But whatever may be the relative moderation of this School, the point of view is substantially the same as the other. The distinctions are only those of degree.

KARL HASE, in his "Theologische Streitschriften" (1834—37), has left to the vulgar rationalism nothing whatever to stand on, and there is not at this hour, in Germany, a solitary theologian of commanding position who adheres to the old Vulgar Rationalism. That which swept over Germany like a flood has passed away, and left nothing but memorials of the death which it brought with it.

4. *Supranaturalism.*

Supranaturalism maintains the necessity and actuality of positive revelation, and acknowledges the revelation furnished in Scripture as the norm of religious truth. Often, however, it has been a little more than a certain compromise between Reason and Revelation. The Scripture indeed was to decide, but Reason nevertheless determined in various ways what is essential in Scripture, so that the dogmatic result was not as completely distinct from that of Rationalism, as the unconditional recognition of the supremacy of God's Word would have made it. This was the middle tendency of the so-called Supranaturalistic Rationalism and Rationalistic Supranaturalism, which may be likened to

chemical compounds which have the same parts in the same proportion, with diversity of arrangement.

FRANZ VOLKMAR REINHARD (d. 1812) exercised the greatest influence as a preacher, and in his sermons[1] he maintained that we must either hold entirely to Reason or entirely to Scripture, and that it is impossible to co-ordinate them, for to be logical we are compelled to subordinate the one to the other. Yet even in the case of Reinhard, the relation to revelation and to the doctrine of Scripture was too external, and his understanding of the Church Doctrine was very defective.

GEORGE CHRISTIAN KNAPP (d. 1825), professor of theology at Halle (1777), and director of the Francke Institution (1785), occupies the same general position as Reinhard, but with a closer approximation to the doctrines of the Church. His chief work, *"Lectures on Christian Theology,"*[2] was translated into English by Leonard Woods, and has been widely used.

AUGUST HAHN (d. 1863) was one of the last representatives of the old Supranaturalism, but in the second edition of his *Lehrbuch des Christlichen Glaubens"* (1857) the influence of the positive Church renewal of theology shows itself.

As Reinhard represented Supranaturalism in the north, GOTTLIEB CHRISTIAN STORR (d. 1805), professor of theology at Tübingen after 1777, represented it in the south of Germany. His chief work, *"Doctrinæ christianæ pars theoretica"*[3] shows pre-eminently the

[1] His collected sermons comprise 35 volumes. His *Confessions*, translated into English, in which he presents the history of his own development as a preacher, is of value.

[2] 2 vols., Andover, 1831—33.

[3] Appeared in 1793, was translated into German, with extensive explanations and additions by FLATT, in 1803, and this last was translated by S. S. SCHMUCKER of Gettysburg, under the title,

biblical tendency of the Würtemberg or Old Tübingen School, and is still valuable as a book of reference.

JOHANN FRIEDRICH FLATT (d. 1812) and FRIEDRICH GOTTLIEB SUESKIND (d. 1829), the immediate followers of Storr, and able representatives of the Old Tübingen School, sought by emphasizing the Bible as the only source of the knowledge of the faith, to establish and vindicate the doctrine of the Church by a moderate biblical interpretation.

This tendency was represented in polemic antithesis toward the philosophical perversion of the Christian faith by STEUDEL (d. 1837), professor of theology at Tübingen after 1815. In his *"Lehrbegriff der evang. protest. Kirche"* (1834) he has throughout reference to Schleiermacher and Hegel, against whose views he directs his polemic.

JOHANN TOBIAS BECK (d. 1878), professor of theology at Tübingen after 1843, returned decisively and completely to the standpoint of the Old Tübingen School, and is the ablest modern representative of the Würtemberg or Pietistic School of Bengel, Oetinger and Roos. His views are presented in his two works, *"Einleitung in das System der christ. Lehre"* (1838, 2nd ed. 1870), *"Die christ. Lehrwissenschaft"* (1 Th. die Logik der christ. Lehre, 1841, 2nd ed. 1875). His thought and style are heavy and dull, but his matter is of great intrinsic value. He contends that theology shall be completely separated from all the philosophy and the culture of the time, and this he would accomplish by binding and establishing it upon the Scriptures, but he does this in a way which shows that he has a wrong conception with regard to the operation of the Holy Spirit in the Church, of the witnesses of the

"Biblical Theology of Storr and Flatt" (2 vols., Andover, 1826. Reprinted in England, 1845).

Church, and of the history of the Church, and he has so completely ignored the dogmatic labors of others as to have had comparatively limited influence upon the development of theology.

On the whole, Supranaturalism, though opposed to Rationalism and contending for much peculiar to the old faith of the Church, shared also in the infection of the time and abandoned much. It did not build up so well as it fought. And Pietism in its noblest form is never well fitted to take up arms in defence of Revelation,—on the contrary, in its farther development it generally shows a tendency towards rationalism. It takes a much greater interest in life than in doctrine, and is indeed adverse to the scholastic form in which the orthodox system is presented; it is lukewarm to the idea of pure doctrine for purity's own sake, and on account of this indifferentism to the extension of truth for truth's own sake, pietism may come to consider Scripture simply a practical means to a practical end, and not keep the source of all truth ever flowing. It is unionistic in its tendency, and is so firmly determined to make religion, first and foremost, a practical issue, that it sometimes shrinks into a narrow brotherhood of the faithful, with no interest for the Church Universal. In fact, even at its best estate, Pietism has always lacked certain elements of the highest form of Lutheran Christianity, and is simply a pure Christianity in a feeble, feverish state of health, lacking force, freshness, largeness, and positiveness of doctrine, and is never able to cope with error and rationalism with any hope of success.

§ 21. The Dogmatics of the most Recent Time.

The Dogmatics of the most recent time is marked by depth and geniality and by the struggle between the mediating and the strictly logical and churchly tendencies.

1. *The Renewal of Religious Faith.*

The renewal of the religious faith and life, as it was called forth by the earnestness of the time, in the first decennium of the 19th century, in Germany, had at first a merely general Christian character. Gradually, however, under the influence of the historic feeling which is strongly characteristic of our era, and which has made itself felt in every department of scientific life, it went back to the life of faith in the past, in order to connect itself in unity with it. There were two paths on which the return was made to positive theology and to the doctrine of the Church: 1) that of philosophical thinking, and 2) that of emotion.

2. *The Philosophy of this Period.*

Philosophy had advanced from the criticism of KANT (d. 1804) to the Idealism of FICHTE (d. 1814). The unity which had been sought analytically by Kant was still pursued by Fichte, and was found by him in the Ego, over against which he placed the Cosmos or external world as the Non-Ego, and which in its absoluteness is connected with the moral advance of mankind. This moral advance on which he dwelt in his system, the moral order of the Cosmos, was Fichte's god. On this account he was accused of Atheism, and deposed from his position as professor of philosophy at Jena (1799).

In his later speculations he was inclined more to a mystical Pantheism.

Another of the great names in Philosophy, of this era, is that of SCHELLING (d. 1854). It is usual to divide his intellectual life into three periods. His earlier philosophy is but a philosophic expression of that yearning to comprehend the absolute as it appears above all in Goethe's *Faust,* and his system is the highest glorification of genius as celebrated by the romantic school. By speculative knowledge alone, Schelling expects a regeneration of esoteric Christianity and the proclamation of the absolute Gospel. The doctrine of the Trinity, of the Incarnation, and similar doctrines, are regarded as symbolic expressions of the relation of the infinite and the finite. His second period is characterized by his inclination to theosophic speculation and the influence of Christian mysticism, especially of Jacob Böhme. In his later period we have one of the greatest endeavors of modern philosophy to construct the system of Christian doctrine. He distinguishes three ages of Church History, and names them after the characters and names of the three Apostles: 1) *The Petrine Period,* or Catholicism; 2) *The Pauline Period,* or Protestantism; 3) *The Johannean Period,* or the "Church of the future."[1]

Closely allied to Schelling we have the speculations of FRANZ VON BAADER (d. 1841), who has been called "the greatest speculative theologian of modern Catholicism," and who found many followers, especially in South Germany.

While Schelling was laboring in quietude, HEGEL (d. 1831) took the philosophical chair of the era and read to the world a "collegium logicum" in grand style. His

[1] See Heyder in *Herzog.*

philosopsy swept away all other philosophies as if they were mere dust, and before he died it began to make itself felt as an actual power both in State and Church.

The adherents of the School of Hegel, after their master's death, divided into two parts, of which one, called the "right wing" (Erdmann, Rosenkranz), was on the side of Christianity, and the other, or "left wing" (Feuerbach, Bruno Bauer), took ground against Christianity.

The course of philosophy reflected itself in theology. With no theologian of this era was this more the case than with KARL DAUB (d. 1836), who has been called "the founder of Protestant speculative theology." The rapid development of the German philosopsy in his age compelled him to change his views repeatedly. Originally writing as a Kantist (1801), he has left for Fichte in 1805, and by 1806 has already reached Schelling. For several years he is under the influence of Schelling and of his mystical ideas (1810), but by 1816 it is evident that he is steering towards Hegel, and in the Hegelian philosophy he finally anchors, which he applies to theology (in his *Dogmatische Theologie jetziger Zeit,*" 1833).

A similar experience is that of PHILIPP KONRAD MARHEINEKE (d. 1846), professor of theology at Berlin after 1811. His "*Dogmatik,*" in the edition of 1819, took the position of Schelling, the second edition of 1827, that of Hegel, and the same position is occupied by the edition published in 1847 by two of his pupils, Matthies and Vatke, which last is much clearer than his earlier work. Marheineke came to be recognized as the leader of the "right wing" of the Hegelian School, which affirmed that Hegelianism can be reconciled with positive Christianity.

The Hegelian philosophy imagined that it had restored peace between the doctrine of the Church and Philosophy. But the deep cleft which actually separates them was uncovered by DAVID F. STRAUSS (d. 1874), who brought together the negative elements of Hegelianism, in order to show the invincible conflict between the modern consciousness, that view of the world which rested upon the theory of Immanence, on the one side, and the doctrine of the Church, on the other. The theory of a God lost in the world, which is that of Immanence, cannot be harmonized with the true view of the Church, of an extra-mundane and personal Deity. With the materials of Hegelianism, Strauss endeavored to annihilate the Church doctrine, in a work which he calls his *"Christliche Glaubenslehre,"*[1] which has been characterized as resembling a theology in the same way that a cemetery resembles a city. In this book he tries to demonstrate that the history of Christian doctrine is the history of its dissolution, and that theology can have no other future than that of transition into philosophy.

Deeply influenced by Strauss, and a disciple of Hegel, ALOIS EMANUEL BIEDERMANN (d. 1885), professor of theology at Zurich after 1850, and a leading rationalist, in his *"Crhistliche Dogmatik"*[2] denies the historical character of the Gospels, the personality of God, a personal immortality to man, and yet holds that love to God and man constitutes the essence of religion.

3. *The Theology of Emotion.*

During these movements in the theological world, the emotional theology had already won for itself an independent sphere. This it did by recognizing religion

[1] Two volumes, Tuebingen, 1840, 41.
[2] Second edition, 2 vols., Berlin, 1884, 85.

as a thing not of cognition and knowledge, but of internal life, and showed its place in the immediate consciousness, or emotion. LESSING (d. 1781) had already appealed to the internal assurance of the believer as something which could not be shaken by the assaults upon Scripture.

JACOBI (d. 1819) has represented the right of immediate emotion in the assurance of the supersensuous, and thus had won a foothold for a mystical Christianity. Jacobi believed, indeed, that there was an irreconcilable conflict between thinking and feeling, between the head and the heart, and declared that he himself was a Christian with his heart, a heathen with his head.

Attaching himself to Jacobi, and employing at the same time Kant's method of analysis, FRIES (d. 1843) pointed out in reason the immediate organ of the divine, whose internal revelation was only vivified or quickened by all further revelation.

The influence of this philosophy is shown by DE WETTE (d. 1849). In his work *"Ueber Religion und Theologie"*[1] he develops the fundamental aspects of his philosophy, to which he faithfully adhered through life. In his *"Bibl. Dogmatik"* (1813 and 1831) he presents the religious ideas of Scripture (Biblical Theology), and in his *"Kirchl. Dogm."* (1816 and 1840) he was more in affinity with the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, but his own system, which is more popular and positive, and at the same time showing more the influence of Schleiermacher, he presents in his *"Wesen des Glaubens"* (1846).

This tendency became an epoch-making power under the influence of FRIEDRICH SCHLEIERMACHER[2] (d. 1834),

[1] Berlin, 1815. New edition, 1821.

[2] Compare Jonas and Dilthey: *Aus Schleiermachers Leben, in Briefen*, 4 vols., Berlin, 1858—61. Translated in part into English:

professor of theology at Berlin after 1810. In order to preserve theology from all false blending with philosophy, he endeavored to discover the proper sphere of religion in man. This he found in immediate consciousness, or in feeling, and the feeling in which he found it was that of absolute dependence. He therefore considered that theology had nothing to do with speculation, any more than religion has to do with thinking, and he maintained that philosophy and theology should be kept apart, although his own theology is penetrated to the core by his philosophy.

As a speculative theologian he ranks among the greatest of all ages. The effect of his early training and the type of Moravian Christianity can be clearly traced in his dogmatic writings. Though belonging to the Reformed Church, he labored for its union with the Lutheran Church, and this syncretism developed into rationalism, while his pietism developed into supranaturalism, and yet he cannot be classed with the rationalists, nor with the supranaturalists, nor with the mystics, but combined in himself elements from all.

His greatest work, *"Der christliche Glaube,"* has been called "a monument of religious enthusiasm and philosophical reasoning which has no equal in the theological literature after Calvin's *Institutiones.*" The touch-stone on which a dogma is to be tried is not the direct teaching of the Scriptures, nor the demonstration of proofs drawn from reason, but our feelings. He rejected the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity and of the Person of Christ, of the Devil and the fall of the angels, of inspiration and the canon, and taught an ultimate restoration,—in fact, his errors are as numerous as those of Origen. "Yet he ever held fast to

The Life of Schleiermacher, 2 vols., London, 1860; W. Gass: in *Herzog;* Ueberweg: *History of Philosophy*, Vol. 2, pp. 244—254.

Christ as the greatest fact in history, as the one only sinless and perfect man in whom the Divinity dwelt in its fulness, and from whom saving influences emanate from generation to generation, and from race to race. In this central idea lies Schleiermacher's chief merit in theology, and his salutary influence. He modestly declined the honor of being the founder of a school; and his best pupils, as Neander, Twesten, Nitzsch, Lücke, Bleek, Ullmann, Julius Müller, went far beyond him in the direction of a positive evangelical creed."[1]

The impulse which Schleiermacher gave to the religious consciousness and also to the scientific method of Dogmatics, will continue to operate, at least in Germany, for a long time. Two distinguished theologians have attached themselves most closely to Schleiermacher. The first of these was K. IMMANUEL NITZSCH (d. 1868), professor of theology at Bonn (1822—47), and at Berlin (1847—68), who was a theologian in the fullest sense of the word. In his "*System of Christian Doctrine*"[2] he combines Dogmatics and Ethics and rests both upon the Scripture, as the restoration of religious consciousness, as it reveals itself in the Apostolic announcement in its original form for all ages. He thus substituted for Schleiermacher's "Christian consciousness" the Word of God itself.

The second theologian, AUGUST CHRISTIAN TWESTEN (d. 1876), professor of theology at Berlin after 1834, was also a pupil of Schleiermacher. His lectures on *Dogmatics*[3] are very thorough, but were never completed, and he forms a transition from the emotional

[1] See article in *Schaff-Herzog.*

[2] Published in 1829. Sixth edition, 1853. Fifth edition translated into English. Edinburgh, 1849.

[3] *Vorlesungen ueber die Dogm. der evang. luther. Kirche*, 2 vols., Hamburg (Vol. 1, Introd. and Critical Part, 1826; 4th ed., 1838. Vol. 2, Theology and Angelology, 1838).

theology to a stricter Lutheran orthodoxy. He delineates dogmatics as a justification of the doctrine of the Church, a doctrine which the dogmatician is to reproduce from his inner consciousness of faith.

4. *The Dogmatics of the Mediating Theology.*

This theology attempts to harmonize the opposition of the rationalistic and the positive, of the philosophical and emotional tendency. This it does in combinations of divers kinds, and hence is represented by a series of theologians who approximate on the one side to Rationalism, and on the other to the doctrine of the Church.

To the former school belongs KARL AUGUST HASE, since 1830 professor of theology at Jena, who indeed gave the death-blow to vulgar rationalism, yet is the dogmatic representative of the rationalistic principle. Hase unites the historic feeling of the recent time with the speculative enthusiasm of modern philosophy and a tendency to the ideal. His *"Evang. Dogmatic"*[1] was written for theologians, but his *"Gnosis"*[2] was addressed to the educated laity. According to him religion is the attraction of Love to the Infinite, only approximately attained by other men, but reached and presented in the supremest degree in the man Jesus, thus making him the centre of a fellowship of all noble spirits who are striving after unity with the Infinite, i. e., with God. In its results his theology differs very little from that of Rationalism.

DANIEL SCHENKEL (d. 1885), professor of theology at Heidelberg after 1851, at first almost orthodox, be-

[1] Leipsic, 1826. Sixth edition, 1870. To be distinguished from his *Hutterus Redivivus, oder Dogmatik der evang. luth. Kirche.* 1829. Twelfth edition, 1883. In this last work he attempts to present the doctrine of the Lutheran Church as Hutter would have represented it, if living.

[2] Three vols., 1827—29. Third edition, 1893.

came the leader of the *Protestantenverein.* In his dogmatics, the peculiar character of which is expressed in its title, *"Die christliche Dogmatik vom Standpunkte des Gewissens"* (2 vols., 1858—59), he clings closely to Schleiermacher.

ALEXANDER SCHWEIZER, professor of theology at Zurich since 1835, a pupil of Schleiermacher, in his *"Glaubenslehre der evangelischen reformirten Kirche"* (2 vols., 1844—47) combines Schleiermacher's absolute feeling of dependence with the Reformed doctrine of predestination. In his later works he stands entirely upon the ground of the so-called "modern consciousness."

RICHARD ROTHE (d. 1867), professor of theology at Heidelberg after 1839, with the exception of a short period (1849—54), during which he lectured at Bonn, presents his entire speculative theological system in his *"Theologische Ethik,"*[1] which has been called "the greatest work of German speculative theology next to Schleiermacher's *"Der Christliche Glaube."* He is characterized by a union peculiar to himself of the religious consciousness of Schleiermacher, and of the speculations and method of Hegel. These he combines so as to present a complete theosophic view of the whole. Next in importance to his *Ethik* is his *Zur Dogmatik,* 1863, and his lectures on *Dogmatik,* imperfectly edited from his manuscripts by Schenkel (2 vols., Heidelberg, 1870).

JOHANN PETER LANGE (d. 1884), professor of theology at Bonn after 1854, one of the most original and fertile theological authors of the Reformed Church of the 19th century, has attempted to place dogmatics in

[1] Three vols., 1845—48. Second edition, thoroughly revised, in 5 vols., 1867—72.

connection with the entire life of the spirit and to harmonize with each other the manifold oppositions of the supernatural and the natural life. This he has done in his brilliant work *"Christliche Dogmatik"* (Heidelberg), which he published in three parts (1. Philosophical Dogmatics, 1849; 2. Positive Dogmatics, 1849; 3. Applied Dogmatics, 1852). His theology is biblical and evangelical, but he is best known as the editor of Lange's *Commentary,* and by his *Life of Christ* (6 vs.).

KARL THEODOR ALBERT LIEBNER (d. 1871), successively professor of theology at Göttingen, Kiel, and Leipsic, and court-preacher at Dresden (1855), attempted to enrich dogmatics with purely speculative elements, and to shape it into a Christology, in his work *"Die christl. Dogmatik aus dem christologischen Princip dargestellt"* (1849). He maintains that Dogmatics must go forth from the idea of the God-man, as the synthesis, by means of the analysis of the actual unity of the divine and human given therein, and he thus unfolds what he calls "the system of all systems," "a faithful scientific photograph of the full unabridged Christianity, as our fathers held it."

The ripest fruit of this whole development, with reference at the same time to the most recent contributions to dogmatics, is given by ISAAC AUGUST DORNER (d. 1884), professor of theology at Kiel (1839), Königsberg (1843), Bonn (1847), Göttingen (1853), and finally at Berlin (1862), in his *"System der Christlichen Glaubenslehre."*[1] As one of the profoundest and most learned theologians of the 19th century he ranks with Schleiermacher, Neander, Nitzsch, Julius Müller, and Richard Rothe. With a positive faith and an his-

[1] 2 vols., Berlin, 1879—80. Second edition, 1886. Translated into English with the title, "A System of Christian Doctrine," 4 vols., Edinburgh, 1880—82.

torical spirit he sought to unite the theology of Schleiermacher and the philosophy of Hegel. His theology is pre-eminently christological.

JOHANNES HEINRICH EBRARD (born 1818), in his *"Christliche Dogmatik"*[1] presented without philosophical speculation, in essentials retaining the Church orthodoxy, the Reformed Dogmatics as an expression of the Christian consciousness of salvation, but he excludes the doctrine of absolute Predestination.

ROBERT BENJAMIN KUEBEL, professor of theology at Tübingen since 1879, in his *"Christliche Lehrsystem"* (1873) represents the biblical school of Würtemberg.

LUDWIG FRIEDRICH SCHOEBERLEIN (d. 1881), professor of theology at Göttingen after 1855, in his *"Grundlehren des Heils"* (1848), *"Die Geheimnisse des Glaubens"* (1872), and his last work, *"Das Prinzip und System der Dogmatik"* (1881), shows a strong mystical tendency.

HEINRICH JOHANN MATTHIAS VOIGT, since 1864 professor of theology at Königsberg, in his *"Fundamental Dogmatik"* (Gotha, 1874) has given us a careful and full discussion of the fundamental questions that arise in dogmatics.

5. *The Dogmatics of Modern Scientific Rationalism.*

ALBRECHT RITSCHL (d. 1889), professor of theology at Göttingen, was a determined opponent of Protestant Scholasticism, and is the only recent theologian who has founded a school of theology. His view of justification and atonement, of reconciliation and grace, of sin and law, are so peculiar, that he reconstructs the very scheme of redemption. His views are especially seen in his *"Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung*

[1] 2 vols., 1851. Second edition, 1862.

und Versoehnung,"[1] a work which has attracted much attention. He describes his theological standpoint as follows: "In the strictest recognition of the revelation of God through Christ; most accurate use of the Holy Scripture as the foundation of the knowledge of the Christian religion; view of Jesus Christ as the ground of knowledge for all parts of the theological system; in accord with the original documents of the Lutheran Reformation respecting those peculiarities which differentiate its type of doctrine from that of the Middle Ages."

Ritschl has a large following among the younger professors of theology. KAFTAN (born 1848), Dorner's successor in Berlin, is under his influence, so is HERRMANN (born 1846), professor of theology at Marburg, the theological faculty at Giessen holds to his views, and HERMANN SCHULTZ (born 1836) of Göttingen and LIPSIUS of Jena defend the essential positions of his theology. Against him are arrayed such men as Frank of Erlangen, and Luthardt, Fricke and Bestmann of Leipsic.

RICHARD ADELBERT LIPSIUS (born 1830), professor of theology at Jena since 1870, is a follower of Kant in philosophy, and of Schleiermacher in theology. In his *"Lehrbuch der evang. prot. Dogmatik,"*[2] and in his *"Dogmatische Beitraege"* (1878), he seeks to build up a system of dogmatics founded upon the religious experience of the Christian communion and of the individual believer. In fact, he bases the evidence of all Christian and religious truth on experience.

[1] 3 vols., 1870—74. Third edition, 1888—89. The first volume has been translated into English.

[2] Third edition, 1893.

6. *Confessional Dogmatics.*

a) Lutheran.

The confessional dogmatics of the Lutheran Church shaped itself by the side of the theology of mediation, exhibiting more and more the tendency to return to that doctrine of the Church which is embodied in her great Confessions of the sixteenth century. This tendency shows itself in two classes of works: 1) in those which outline the confessional doctrines historically, and 2) in those which are an independent reproduction of that doctrine.

Some of the best books of the first class come from the hand of men who were too much under the influence of the perverted thinking of the age to embrace the doctrine they so ably presented.

Among the works of this class may be mentioned the *"Hutterus Redivivus"* of KARL HASE (12th ed., 1883), which is a model of literary skill. By condensing the matter, and using abridgments of frequently recurring words, he has condensed into a narrow space a vast fund of information. He gave to it the name of the old dogmatician HUTTER, whose fidelity to the Confessions and whose ability as a theologian has preserved his memory in the Church, and his object was to present the System of Dogmatics, as Hutter might have been supposed to present it, were he actually *(redivivus)* restored to life.

The well known work of HEINRICH SCHMID[1] differs from that of Hase, in that it is confined to the older dogmaticians, and from these its citations are much fuller.

[1] Translated into English under the title of "The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church," Second English Edition, revised according to the Sixth German, by Doctors Hay and Jacobs, Philadelphia, 1889.

Under the second class of works on confessional dogmatics, in which the writers have given to us, not the history of the dogmatic thinking of others, but their own independent reproduction of Christian doctrine, we have contributions from some of the profoundest and most brilliant scholars of the age.

The *"Dogmatics"* of HANS LASSEN MARTENSEN (d. 1884), the most eminent Danish theologian of the 19th century, has been favorably received. LUTHARDT says of it "that it exhibits spirit and versatility, and is suggestive, rich in apologetic and speculative elements." The work is indubitably profound, clear in the main and concise. But while we place it among the works of confessional dogmatics, it is far from being a guide which can be followed implicitly. He professes to hold to the type of doctrine as confessed by the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church, especially to the Augsburg Confession, and aims at reproducing the doctrine of Scripture and the Church scientifically from the depths of a consciousness, which is regenerated and filled with the idea of the Christian truth, nevertheless his Lutheran theology has been greatly influenced by the philosophy of Hegel and the theosophic views of Franz Baader, and in various points departs from the confessional teaching of the Lutheran Church.

The next great name among the Lutheran Confessional Dogmaticians is that of ERNEST SARTORIUS (d. 1859), who, in addition to various minor publications on dogmatics, has presented his system most fully in his treatise on *"The Doctrine of Divine Love."*[1]

GOTTFRIED THOMASIUS (d. 1875), professor of theology at Erlangen after 1842, in his *"Christi Person*

[1] Translated into English from the last German edition. Edinburgh, 1884.

und Werk"[1] has made the Person of Christ the centre of his system, and on every page gives evidence of his thorough acquaintance with the history of doctrines. It is in this work that he presents the modern "Kenotic" theory in its developed form, and claims that this view is the legitimate outcome of the fundamental principles on which the Lutheran doctrine of Christ's person is based.

One of the safest and best guides among the larger systems of recent date is that of FRIEDRICH ADOLF PHILIPPI[2] (d. 1882), professor of theology at Dorpat (1841) and at Rostock after 1852. He is the best modern representative of Lutheran orthodoxy.

KARL FRIEDRICH AUGUST KAHNIS, professor of theology at Leipsic (1850—86), one of the ablest theologians of the 19th century, in his *"Luth. Dogm. histor. genet. dargestellt"*[3] abandons the doctrine of the supreme divinity of Christ, and gives up the true doctrine of the Sacramental Presence, and by his looseness in regard to the doctrine of Inspiration makes his claim to a place among the confessional dogmaticians more than doubtful.

Of a strictly confessional type is the *"Dogmatik"*[4] of AUGUST FRIEDRICH CHRISTIAN VILMAR (d. 1868). As a compendium for students it takes the very highest rank.

Not the least among the confessional dogmaticians of the Lutheran Church is the name of FRANZ HERMANN REINHOLD FRANK[5] (d. 1893), professor of theology at Erlangen after 1858. In his later writings

[1] Third edition, 2 vols., Erlangen, 1886—88.
[2] *Kirchliche Glaubenslehre*, 9 vols., 1883.
[3] Second edition, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1874—75.
[4] In two vols., Guetersloh, 1874.
[5] His earlier work, "Die Theologie der Concordienformel," 4 vols., Erlangen, 1858—65, is the standard on that subject.

he is noted for his profound reasoning and for the stress he lays upon the subjective element in faith.[1]

One of the latest of distinguished living theologians is CHRISTOPH ERNST LUTHARDT, since 1856 professor of theology at Leipsic, and renowned as a university lecturer and pulpit orator. His *"Compendium der Dogmatik"* had already reached the ninth edition in 1893.

The work is not, strictly speaking, the development of a system, but rather a compendious presentation of carefully selected material. It is by far the best manual of the Dogmatics of the Evangelical Lutheran Church we possess. It gives the most important recent literature under each head, and because of its comprehensiveness, brevity, and succintness, we have taken it as a basis of our own presentation, and would especially recommend it to students.[2]

Of the confessional dogmaticians of Sweden we would especially mention the name of CARL OLOF BJÖRLING (d. 1884), Bishop of Westerås after 1866. The second edition of his *Christian Dogmatics according to the Confessions of the Lutheran Church* (1866) adheres more closely to the teaching of the Confessions of our Church than his first edition. He closely follows Philippi in the arrangement of his Dogmatic system, and his method is to present first a scientific exposition of each doctrine, then to explain the Biblical foundation, followed by a concise history of the doctrine from

[1] His three well known works, *System der christ. Gewissheit. System der christ. Wahrheit, System der christ. Sittlichkeit*, each in two volumes, covering respectively the sciences of Apologetics, Dogmatics, and Ethics, have lately appeared in new editions, and all three are of the most profound and important works on theology produced in the last half of the 19th century. His literary executors have published, since his death, his *Geschichte und Kritik der neueren Theologie*, insbesondere der systematischen, seit Schleiermacher (1894).

[2] For a complete synopsis of his system see pp. 141—149

the time of the Early Church, concluding with the modern development of the doctrine. In certain parts of his works he is somewhat speculative, but not to such a degree as to deserve the name of a speculative theologian. These speculative tendencies are most apparent in his discussion of the doctrine of Angels, of the Trinity, and of Eschatology.

The Outlines of the Christian Doctrine of Faith, published by DR. S. L. BRING of Lund, from 1869—77, is strictly confessional, and is noted for its warmth of presentation, and "is spiritually edifying and refreshing in a very high degree."[1]

AXEL F. GRANFELT (d. 1892), professor at the University of Helsingfors, Finland, belonged to the mediating school of theology, and his *Christian Dogmatics* shows that he was largely influenced by Martensen and Von Hofmann, and by the Kenoticism of Thomasius. But it is especially in the discussion of eschatological questions that he departs most widely from the teachings of the Lutheran Church.

Strictly confessional is the work of GISLE JOHNSON of the University of Christiania, Norway. His *Outlines of Systematic Theology* is noted for its clearness, conciseness, and depth, and has been largely used as a text-book.

The well-known work of KROGH-TONNING (3 vols., Christiania, 1885—1889) also takes the highest rank, and although on some points he might be criticised, he nevertheless can be regarded as confessional and as representing the views of the Lutheran Church. His tendency, however, seems to be to minimize the difference between Lutheranism and Roman Catholicism.

[1] Compare an able article on *Recent Dogmatic Thought in Scandinavia* in "The Presbyterian and Reformed Review," Oct. 1893, by Prof. C. E. Lindberg, D. D.

In the Lutheran Church in the United States there are two theologians of the strict confessional tendency who have left their dogmatic impress upon the Church.

CHARLES PORTERFIELD KRAUTH (d. 1883), professor of theology in the Lutheran Seminary at Philadelphia after 1864, has been the leader in the establishment of the General Council (1867), and has given shape to its strict confessional basis.[1] In his most important work, *"The Conservative Reformation and its Theology"* (Philadelphia, 1871) he has given evidence of the strictest adherence to the doctrines of our Church as confessed in her Symbolical Books.

CARL FERDINAND WILHELM WALTHER (d. 1887), professor of theology at St. Louis after 1849, the founder and leader of the Synod of Missouri (Synodical Conference),[2] is by pre-eminence the representative of Lutheran Orthodoxy, a *Calovius redivivus*, equally zealous in controversy and positive in polemics. Although not the author of any system of dogmatics, he has written on almost all its topics, and has edited with great ability Baier's *Compend*,[3] in three volumes, a work which seems to have been his greatest favorite among the dogmaticians of the seventeenth century.

b) Reformed (German).

HEINRICH LUDWIG JULIUS HEPPE (d. 1879), professor of theology at Marburg after 1864, from the position of the German Reformed unionism in Germany, has given us several valuable works of a historical character. The principal are *"Die Dogmatik des Protestantismus im 16 Jahrhundert"* (3 vols., Gotha, 1857) and *"Die Dog. der evang. reformirten Kirche"* (Elber-

[1] See *note* 1 on pp. 137, 139.

[2] See *note* 1, p. 137.

[3] St. Louis, 1879.

feld, 1860). This last is nearly identical in plan with the work of HEINRICH SCHMID, described above.

The best representative of German Reformed Theology in the United States is found in the able work of EMANUEL V. GERHART, published under the title of *"Institutes of the Christian Religion* (2 vols., 1891—94).

c) Reformed (Dutch).

The best representative of the theology of the Dutch Reformed Church is JAN JAKOB VAN OOSTERZEE (d. 1882), professor of theology at Utrecht after 1862, and the recognized leader of the evangelical movement in Holland. His *"Christian Dogmatics"* has been translated into English from the Dutch (London and New York, 1874), and his American editors regard it, among the numerous foreign systems of Theology, "as being upon the whole the work best adapted to the wants of English and American students, and nearer, perhaps, to the prevailing type of Anglo-American Theology than any similar work produced of late years on the continent of Europe." This "prevailing type of Anglo-American Theology," here referred to, is, of course, Reformed in its tendency, and not Lutheran.

d) Church of England, or Episcopalian.

A standard work of the dogmatic theology of the Church of England is the well-known *"Exposition of the XXXIX Articles"* (12th ed., 1882; American ed. by Bishop Williams of Connecticut, 1865) by EDWARD HAROLD BROWNE, Bishop of Winchester from 1873 to 1890. The English Church has produced no great systematic theologian, in the true meaning of the term, though we have excellent handbooks and works on special topics by such writers as BUEL, BLUNT, FORBES,

GOULBURN, LIDDON, LITTON, MOULE, NORRIS, PUSEY, SADLER, WESTCOTT, and WILBERFORCE.

e) Congregational.

RALPH WARDLAW (d. 1823), professor of theology at Glasgow after 1811, was for a long time one of the prominent leaders of the Congregational churches in Scotland. His *"System of Theology"* (3 vols., 1856—57) was published after his death.

In the history of Congregationalism in the United States, pre-eminent among the theologians of the 19th century, are the names of SAMUEL HOPKINS (d. 1803), whose system had its root in the writings of the elder Jonathan Edwards (d. 1758), and was essentially Calvinistic, but distinguished as "Hopkinsianism," NATHANAEL EMMONS (d. 1840), who developed the system of Hopkins into what is characterized as "Emmonism," NATHANIEL WILLIAM TAYLOR (d. 1858), the founder of "The New Haven Theology," the elder LEONARD WOODS (d. 1854), "the judicious divine of the later New England theology," and CHARLES G. FINNEY (d. at Oberlin, 1875).

The best modern presentation of Congregational theology will be found in the works of STEARNS and FAIRBAIRN.

LEWIS FRENCH STEARNS, professor of systematic theology in the Theological Seminary at Bangor, Me., from 1880 to 1892, in his *Present Day Theology* (New York, 1893) endeavors to reconcile Calvinism and Arminianism, and develops his system on the Christocentric principle. SCHAFF: This is not a complete scientific work, but a fresh popular discussion of the leading doctrines of the Christian faith by a devout and thoughtful American, who had studied with Hodge in Princeton, with Smith in New York, with Dorner in

Berlin, and with Kahnis and Luthardt in Leipsic, and who mediates between Presbyterian and Congregational Calvinism.

f) Presbyterian.

Among the dogmatic theologians of the Presbyterian Church we would especially mention the names of CHARLES HODGE, WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, and HENRY BOYNTON SMITH.

CHARLES HODGE (d. 1878), professor of theology at Princeton, New Jersey, after 1822, achieved distinction in all departments of theology, and exerted the widest influence as a teacher, training more than a thousand ministers. His *"Systematic Theology"* (3 vols., 1871—73) has been called "the greatest system of dogmatics in the English language."

WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, professor of systematic theology in Union Theological Seminary (New York) from 1874 to 1890, in his *"Dogmatic Theology"* (3 vols., 1888—94) presents a strict type of Old School Calvinism, and makes no concession whatever to modern theology.

HENRY B. SMITH, professor of systematic theology in Union Theological Seminary (New York) from 1853 to 1874, in his *System of Christian Theology* (1884, 4th ed. 1890) was the chief leader of the New School Presbyterian Theology, and marks the transition from Theocentric to Christocentric theology.

g) Baptist.

AUGUSTUS HOPKINS STRONG, professor of theology at Rochester, N. Y., since 1872, in his *"Systematic Theology"* (1886, 4th. ed. 1893) has given us a compendium and commonplace book for theological students. The work gives evidence of wide reading and a full mastery of the science of dogmatics.

Of value from the Baptist standpoint are the works of HOVEY, PENDLETON, and DAGG.

h) Methodist.

RICHARD WATSON (d. 1833, in London), in his *Theological Institutes"* (2 vols., 8th ed. 1850) systematized and expounded the theology of John Wesley (d. 1791), and adopts a modified Arminian interpretation of the Bible. This is the text-book of Methodism.

WILLIAM BURT POPE, professor of theology at Manchester, England, since 1867, in his *"Compendium of Christian Theology"* (3 vols., 1875—76, revised edition 1879—81) follows Watson's improved Arminianism.

MINER RAYMOND, professor of theology at Evanston, Ill., since 1864, in his "Systematic Theology" (3 vols., 1877—79) holds to more radical Arminianism.

i) Roman Catholic.

GIOVANNI PERRONE (d. 1876), professor of theology after 1816, has exerted the widest influence in the Roman Catholic Church. His *"Praelectiones theologicae"* appears in two forms, unabridged (in 9 vols., 31st ed. 1865), and abridged (2 vols., 36th ed. 1881), translated into various languages. It is most widely used by the students of the Roman Catholic Church, and comes up most fully to the standard of orthodoxy as set by the Church.

HUGO HURTER, professor of theology at Innsbruck since 1858, has also written a work on dogmatics which has reached a wide circulation. His *"Theologiae Dogmaticae compendium"* (3 vols., 1876) had already reached a fifth edition in 1885.

CARDINAL WISEMAN'S "Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church" (6th Amer. ed., Baltimore, 1862), and CARDINAL GIBBONS'

"The Faith of our Fathers" (36th ed., Baltimore, 1890), present in a popular form the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church.

Select Literature of Dogmatics.

I. *Lutheran.*

TEXT-BOOKS AND SYSTEMS.

1. Baier: Compendium Theol. Positivæ. Ed. by. Walther. 3 vols. St. Louis, 1879. (Very valuable for those who read Latin and German. Price, $8.00.)
2. Björling: Den Christ. Dogmatiken. 2nd ed. 3 vols. Örebro, 1866.
3. Bring: Christ. Troslära. Lund, 1877.
   (The last two are standard works in Swedish.)
4. Frank: System der christ. Gewissheit. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Erlangen, 1881—84.
5. Frank: System der christ. Wahrheit. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Erlangen, 1885—86. 3rd ed. 1894.
   (These last two works by Frank are among the most profound works of theology produced in the last half of the 19th century.)
6. Gerhard: Loci theol. 9 vols. Reprint. Berlin, 1863.
7. Hase: Hutterus redivivus. 12th ed. Leipsic, 1883.
8. Jacobs: Elements of Religion. Philadelphia, 1894.
9. Krauth: Conservative Reformation. Philadelphia, 1871.
10. Krogh-Tonning: Christ. Dogm. Fundamental-lære. 3 vols. 1889.
11. Luthardt: Kompendium der Dogmatik. 9th ed. Leipsic, 1893.
12. Luthardt: Fundamental Truths. Edinburgh, 1869.
13. Luthardt: Moral Truths. Edinburgh, 1868.
14. Luthardt: Saving Truths. Edinburgh, 1868.
15. Martensen: Christian Dogmatics. Edinburgh, 1866.
16. Philippi: Kirch. Glaubenslehre. 3rd ed. 9 vols. 1883.
17. Schmid: Doct. Theol. of the Lutheran Church. 2nd ed. Phil'a, 1889.
18. Thomasius: Christi Person und Werk. 3rd ed. 2 vols. 1888.
19. Vilmar: Dogmatik. 2 vols. Guetersloh, 1874.

2. *German Reformed.*

TEXT-BOOKS AND SYSTEMS.

1. Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion. Many editions.
2. Ebrard: Christ. Dogmatik. 2nd ed. 2 vols. 1863.
3. Gerhart: Institutes of the Christian Religion. 2 vols. 1891—94.
4. Heppe: Dogm. der evang. reform. Kirche. Elberfeld, 1861.
5. Heppe: Dogm. des Prot. im 16ten Jahrh. 3 vols. Gotha, 1857.
6. Lange: Christ. Dogmatik. 3 vols. 1870.
7. Schweizer: Die Glaubenslehre der reform. Kirche. 2 vols. 1844—47.
8. Van Oosterzee: Christian Dogmatics. 2 vols. 1874. (This last work represents Dutch Reformed Theology.)

3. *Church of England (Episcopal).*

TEXT-BOOKS AND WORKS ON SPECIAL TOPICS.

1. Adolphus: Compendium Theologicum. Cambridge, 1873.
2. Browne: Exposition of the 39 Articles. New York, 1865.
3. Buel: Systematic Theology. 2 vols. New York, 1889.
4. Bull: Defence of the Nicene Creed. Transl. 2 vols. 1851.
5. Forbes: Explan. of Nicene Creed. London, 1886.
6. Forbes: Explan. of 39 Articles. Fifth ed. London.
7. Goulburn: Everlasting Punishment. London, 1881.
8. Hall: The Doctrine of God. Milwaukee, 1892.
9. Hall: The Doctrine of Man and of the God-Man. Milwaukee, 1894.
10. Hooker: Ecclesiastical Polity. Keble's edition. 3 vols. 1845.
11. Jelf: The Thirty-nine Articles. London, 1873.
12. Liddon: The Divinity of our Lord. London, 1876.
13. Litton: Introduction to Dogmatic Theology. 2 vols. London, 1882.
14. Moule: Outlines of Christian Doctrine. London, 1892.
15. Norris: Rudiments of Theology. New York, 1876.
16. Pearson: Exposition of the Creed. Chevallier's edition. 1859.
17. Percival: A Digest of Theology. Phil'a and London, 1893.
18. Pusey: On the Catholic Faith. London, 1891.
19. Randolph: Lectures on Systematic Theology. 3 vols. London, 1869.
20. Ridgeley: Body of Divinity. 2 vols. New York, 1855.

21. Sadler: The Second Adam, etc. (Baptism). London, 1892.
22. Sadler: Emmanuel. London, 1879.
23. Sadler: The One Offering. (The Eucharist.) London, 1889.
24. Sadler: Justification of Life. London, 1888.
25. Sadler: Church Doctrine, etc. London, 1892.
26. Tomline: Elements of Theology. 14th ed. 2 vols. 1843.
27. Westcott: Christus Consummator. London, 1890.
28. Wilberforce: The Doctrine of the Incarnation. London, 1892.
29. Wilberforce: The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. London, 1885.

4. *Congregational.*

1. Dale: The Atonement. 9th ed. 1883.
2. Fairbairn: The Place of Christ in Modern Theology. New York, 1890.
3. Fairchild: Elements of Theology. Oberlin, 1894.
4. Finney: Lectures on Theology. Oberlin, 1878.
5. Fisher: Discussions in History and Theology. N. Y., 1888.
6. Harris: Philosophical Basis of Theism. N. Y., 1893.
7. Harris: Self-Revelation of God. New York, 1892.
8. Stearns: Present-Day Theology. New York, 1893.
9. Walker: Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism, New York, 1893.
10. Wardlaw: System of Theology. 3 vols. 1859.

5. *Presbyterian.*

1. Beard: Lectures on Theology. 3 vols. Nashville, 1871.
2. Bruce: The Humiliation of Christ. New York, 1892.
3. Dabney: Theology, Dogmatic and Polemic. Richmond, 1885.
5. Hodge, Charles: Systematic Theology. 2 vols. N. Y., 1873.
6. Shedd: Dogmatic Theology. 3 vols. New York, 1894.
7. Smith: System of Christian Theology. New York, 1892.

6. *Baptist.*

1. Dagg: Manual of Theology. Charleston, 1859.
2. Hovey: Manual of Systematic Theology. Boston, 1877.
3. Pendleton: Christian Doctrines. 13th ed. Philadelphia, 1885.
4. Strong: Systematic Theology. 4th ed. 1893.

7. *Methodist.*

1. Field: Handbook of Christian Theology. New York, 1887.
2. Miley: Systematic Theology. 2 vols. New York, 1894.
3. Pope: Compendium of Christian Theology. 3 vols. New York, 1881.
4. Pope: Higher Catechism of Theology. New York, 1884.
5. Raymond: Systematic Theology. 3 vols. 1879.
6. Watson: Theological Institutes. 2 vols. 1850.

EXAMINATION QUESTIONS.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. *The Object of the Introduction.* 1. What is discussed in the Introduction? 2. Who was the first writer to use Prolegomena? 3. What five topics does Schmid discuss in his Introduction? 4. What topics are discussed by Philippi? 5. By Martensen?

I. DEFINITION OF DOGMATICS.

§ 2. *Definition of Theology.* 6. Define Theology. 7. In what five various senses has the word "theology" been used? 8. Why was the Apostle John called "the theologian"? 9. What is the common usage of the word? 10. Give some divisions of Theology. 11. Distinguish between archetypal and ectypal theology. 12. Between natural and revealed theology. 13. In what twofold way does Hollaz define theology? 14. Why can we not accept the definition that theology is the science of religion? 15. Why must a true theologian be a regenerated man? 16. What are the means of theological study? Explain. 17. Why does this science demand such profound study? 18. Name some of the most necessary requisites to the successful study of theology. 19. What is the final aim of theology? 20. Of what fourfold aim does Hollaz speak, and how do you explain his statements?

§ 3. *The Claims of Theology.* 21. What four reasons

can you give that theology may be regarded as a positive science? 22. Prove that it is a Biblical science. 23. Show its scientific necessity. 24. What does Shedd say of the sceptical estimate of theology? 25. On what threefold ground does Strong maintain the possibility of theology? 26. Discuss the question of the relation of faith and knowledge. 27. What is Christlieb's testimony? 28. What has been the general relation of Theology and Philosophy in the past? 29. What ought to be the true relation? 30. What does Calovius say on this point? 31. Quenstedt? 32. What is Luthardt's final summary? 33. In what sense is Theology progressive? 34. In what do the limitations of Theology lie?

§ 4. *The Organism of Theology.* 35. Name the four departments of theology. 36. Name all the sciences that belong to each of the four departments. 37. Distinguish between Dogmatics and Ethics. 38. Why is it best to treat them separately?

§ 5. *Name and Definition of Dogmatics.* 39. Under what four headings is this topic discussed? 40. What various names have been given to this science? 41. In what different senses has the word "dogma" been used? 42. How does Martensen define a dogma? 43. How did our older Dogmaticians regard the science of Dogmatics? 44. What does Baumgarten-Crusius say of the different modes of presenting Christian doctrine? 45. To what peculiar opinion of Schleiermacher may much of the indeterminateness of modern German Theology be traced? 46. How does Philippi define Dogmatics? 47. Upon what does Hofmann lay stress? 48. Cite Luthardt's definition as given at the head of this section. 49. How is Dogmatics related to Apologetics? 50. To Ethics? 51. To Biblical Theology? 52. Why is it necessary for Dogmatic Theology to balance and correct Biblical Theology?

II. CONTENTS OF DOGMATICS.

§ 6. *Name and Definition of Religion.* 53. What do you have to say of the universality of religion? 54. What is the derivation of the word? 55. Illustrate from Augustine the true idea of religion. 56. Cite Luthardt's definition as given at the head of this section. 57. What does Beck say of Christianity as the true religion? 58. How does Philippi define Christianity? 59. What does Martensen say of the true religion?

§ 7. *The Origin and Essential Character of Religion.* 60. In what does the origin of religion lie? 61. In what sense is it natural to man? 62. What is the cause of religion in man? 63. Define religion.

§ 8. *The Actuality and Truth of Religion.* 64. Show that religion is not a matter of mere knowledge. 65. Show that it is not a matter of mere activity. 66. Of mere emotion. 67. In what sense is it a matter of the whole inner life? 68. What has been the ordinary definition of religion? 69. What does Beck say of the essence of all actual religion? 70. Define religion in the objective sense, and illustrate. 71. Distinguish between a false and the true religion. 72. What according to Hollaz are the marks of a true religion? 73. Upon what marks does Quenstedt lay stress? 74. In what does the truth of religion reveal itself? 75. How do the perversions of religion arise? 76. In what fourfold way does Luthardt classify this perversion? 77. Explain more fully each of these perversions. 78. Distinguish between natural and positive religion. 79. How does natural religion differ from the religion of nature? 80. Show that natural religion is insufficient for salvation. 81. Define Positive religion.

§ 9. *The Essential Character and Truth of Christianity.* 82. How may Christianity be defined? 83.

How does Philippi express the relation of Christianity to Heathenism and Judaism? 84. How does Martensen present this topic? 85. In what does the essential character of Christianity lie? 86. How does Martensen express this idea? 87. What comparison does he make between Incarnation and Inspiration? 88. In what way have the different Churches apprehended Christianity? 89. How can you prove the truth of the Christian religion? 90. What after all is the strongest evidence?

§ 10. *The Antithesis of Romanism and Protestantism.* 91. Name some of the false explanations of the opposition between Protestantism and Romanism. 92. How has the difference been stated by various writers? 93. Name some of the special characteristics of Romanism. 94. Criticise the position of Romanism. 95. In what does the essential character of Protestantism lie? 96. Distinguish between the formal and material principles of Protestantism. 97. What is the historical usage of the word "Protestants?" 98. Martensen draws the distinction between Protestantism and Romanism with reference to four points. Give an outline of the discussion. 99. Give an outline of Krauth's remarks on Roman Catholicism.

§ 11. *Lutheran Protestantism.* 100. Under what six headings is this topic discussed? 101. Name some of the more important distinctions between Lutheran and Reformed Protestantism. 102. In what sense does the Lutheran Church lay stress upon tradition? 103. What distinction between Lutheran and Reformed Protestantism does Herzog draw? 104. Schweizer? 105. Dorner? 106. Baur? 107. Schneckenburger? 108. Stahl? 109. Martensen? 110. What does Luthardt say of these distinctions? 111. What distinction does Luthardt draw between the formal and material prin-

ciple of Lutheranism? 112. Define the material principle of Lutheranism more fully. 113. The formal principle. 114. Show that Lutheran Protestantism is historical. 115. Prove that the Augsburg Confession is the oldest distinctive creed used in Western Christendom. 116. What is meant by the internal assurance of salvation? 117. By the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit? 118. What is the ground of faith? 119. What is the ground of assurance? 120. What according to Dorner is the true ground of Christian assurance? 121. What position does Philippi take? 122. Frank?

III. THE METHOD OF DOGMATICS.

§ 12. *The Formation of the Dogmatic System.* 123. What is meant by the material principle of Dogmatics? 124. Why does Luther lay so much stress on the article of Justification by faith? 125. Around what doctrines do the systems of Thomasius and Luthardt centre? 126. Of Philippi? 127. What is the normative factor of Dogmatics? 128. Why is Holy Scripture so authoritative? 129. What is meant by the testimony of the Holy Spirit? 130. Why do we in modern times lay so much stress on the evidence of Christian experience? 131. What is the strongest proof of the reality of Christianity? 132. What is meant by the Canon of Scripture? 133. Give a history of the rise of the Old Testament Canon. 134. Show that the Canon of the Old Testament in its present form was known to Christ and his Apostles. 135. What reasons can you give for the canonicity and genuineness of the Book of Daniel? 136. Give a brief history of the rise of the New Testament Canon. 137. What do you know about the Muratorian Canon? 138. About the Peshito? 139. Name the "antilegomena". 140. How does Hollaz establish the canon-

icity of individual books of Scripture? 141. What gifts must the interpreter of Scripture possess? 142. Why must the dogmatician take into consideration the general development of Revelation? 143. What is meant by the perspicuity of Scripture? 144. What distinction does Luther make between an external and an internal clearness? 145. Why does our Church lay so much stress on the Analogy of Faith? 146. Why is our Church so strongly opposed to the theory of a multiple sense of Scripture? 147. What does Gerhard say on this point? 148. State briefly the rules of interpretation as laid down by Gerhard.

§ 13. *The Church Doctrine and the Subjective Consciousness of Faith.* 149. Under how many headings is this subject discussed? 150. Why must Dogmatics have a churchly as well as a biblical character? 151. What does Martensen say on this point? 152. Why are Creeds necessary? 153. What is meant by the internal authority of the Confessions? 154. What by their external authority? 155. What does the Formula of Concord say about the value of the Confessions? 156. What does Dr. Krauth say about the setting aside or making of Creeds? 157. What does a true subscription to the Confessions imply? 158. What does Dr. Krauth say of the right of private judgment? 159. What does Dr. Plitt say on this point? 160. Why is it necessary for a Lutheran to be faithful to the Confessions of his Church? 161. Why ought stress to be laid on fidelity to the Confessions, in theological training? 162. Give an account of the origin of the Apostles' Creed. 163. Of the Nicene Creed. 164. Of the Athanasian Creed. 165. Of the preparation of the Augsburg Confession. 166. Give a brief history of its presentation at the Diet of Augsburg. 167. Of the various editions sent forth

by Melanchthon. 168. How may the contents of the Articles of the Augsburg Confession be classified? 169. Give a brief history of the preparation of the Apology. 170. What may be said of the value of the Apology? 171. Give an account of the origin of the Smalcald Articles. 172. Characterize them. 173. Give an account of the preparation of the two Catechisms. 174. Why was it necessary to prepare a new Confession? 175. Give an account of the preparation of the Torgau Formula of 1576. 176. Of the final appearance of the Formula of Concord. 177. Of the Book of Concord. 178. Distinguish between pure and mixed articles of faith. 179. Distinguish between primary and secondary fundamental articles. 180. Between constituent, antecedent, and consequent articles. 181. What is meant by a non-fundamental article? 182. What does Philippi say about fundamental doctrines? 183. Give the substance of Frank's statement. 184. Give a brief description of the tendencies of the Lutheran Church in this country. 185. Give a brief statement of the Principles of Faith adopted by the General Council. 186. What does Dr. Krauth say of the standpoint of the Lutheran Church? 187. What is meant by the consciousness of faith?

§ 14. *The Disposition of Dogmatics.* 188. How does Luthardt arrange his system? 189. What three dogmaticians follow the order of the Apostles' Creed? 190. Give an outline of Philippi's System. 191. What general plan is followed by Thomasius and Frank? 192. Give a general analysis of Theologia. 193. Of Anthropologia. 194. Of Christologia. 195. Of Soteriologia. 196. Of Pneumatologia. 197. Of Ecclesiologia. 198. Of Eschatologia.

IV. THE HISTORY OF DOGMATICS.

§ 15. *The Dogmatics of the Ancient Church.* 199. What is the general character of the Dogmatics of this period? 200. Name the Apostolical Fathers, and what can be said of their theology. 201. Name the Early Apologists and describe the character of their writings. 202. Name the chief teachers of the Alexandrian School. 203. Give a brief account of Clement of Alexandria, his works, and his theology. 204. Name the two principal works of Origen. 205. What were his chief errors? 206. Name the leading teachers of the New Alexandrian School. 207. Give a brief account of the life and writings of Athanasius. 208. Briefly compare Athanasius with Paul, Luther, and Calvin. 209. What was the character of the theology of Gregory of Nazianzus? 210. Of Basil the Great? 211. Of Gregory of Nyssa? 212. Of Didymus the Blind? 213. Of Cyril of Alexandria? 214. Of Cyril of Jerusalem? 215. Of John of Damascus? 216. What was the general character of the theology of the teachers of the Western Church? 217. Give a brief account of the writings and theology of Irenæus. 218. Of Tertullian. 219. Of Cyprian. 220. Of Hilary. 221. Of Ambrose. 222. Of Augustine. 223. What famous book did Vincent of Lerins write, and why is it referred to? 224. Give a brief account of Isidore. 225. Of Scotus Erigena. 226. Of Boethius.

§ 16. *The Dogmatics of the Middle Ages.* 227. By what was the Dogmatics of the Middle Ages chiefly influenced? 228. Characterize Scholasticism. 229. Distinguish between Realism, Conceptualism, and Nominalism. 230. Name the great Realists of this period. 231. Give a brief account of the writings of Anselm. 232. Of Abelard. 233. Of Bernard of Clairvaux. 234. Name the three Victorines, and give a brief outline of

their tendencies. 235. Describe the influence of Peter Lombard. 236. Of Alexander of Hales. 237. Of Albertus Magnus. 238. Give an account of the theology of Thomas Aquinas. 239. Of Bonaventura. 240. Of Duns Scotus. 241. Who was Roger Bacon? 242. Durand of St. Poursain? 243. William Occam? 244. John Gerson? 245. Gabriel Biel? 246. Name the principal mystics and give a brief account of each. 247. What works of this period had the greatest influence upon Luther? 248. What influence did the Humanists exert?

§ 17. *The Dogmatics of the Century of the Reformation.* 249. What was the general character of the Dogmatics of the 16th century? 250. Characterize the difference between Lutheran and Reformed Dogmatics. 251. Why did Luther exert such a great influence upon the Church of the Reformation? 252. Give a brief sketch of the theology of Melanchthon. 253. In what way did Melanchthon embarrass the friends of the Reformation? 254. Give a brief account of the contents of the "Loci Communes," and name the more important editions. 255. Who was Strigel? 256. Give an account of Selneccer. 257. Of Martin Chemnitz and his works. 258. Who was Heerbrand? 259. Hafenreffer? 260. Give a brief account of Zwingli and his views. 261. Of Calvin and his theology. 262. Who was Bullinger? 263. Ursinus? 264. Olevianus?

§ 18. *The Orthodox Dogmatics of the Seventeenth Century.* 265. Under what topics is this section discussed? 266. What was the general character of the Dogmatics of this period? 267. Give an account of the three general tendencies which were at work in Lutheran Germany in the 17th century? 268. Give an account of the Syncretistic controversy. 269. Of the Pietistic controversy. 270. What was the special character

of the Lutheran Dogmatics of this period? 271. Name some of the great devotional writers of this period. 272. Give an account of Calixtus and his tendencies. 273. Of Calovius. 274. Of Musæus. 275. Of Hunnius and his works. 276. Of Hutter. 277. How does Hutter arrange his system in his Compend? 278. Give an account of Gerhard and of his great work. 279. What is Luthardt's estimate of Gerhard? 280. How does Baier arrange his system? 281. Give a brief account of Dannhauer. 282. Of Huelsemann. 283. Of Koenig. 284. Of Scherzer. 285. Of Quenstedt. 286. Of Hollaz and of his system. 287. Where were the centres of Reformed Theology? 288. Name some of the German Reformed Dogmaticians of this period. 289. Name some of the Reformed Dogmaticians of Switzerland. 290. Of the Netherlands. 291. What is meant by the Governmental theory of the Atonement? 292. Define Arminianism. 293. What did the Supralapsarians teach? 294. Give an account of Descartes and his philosophical system. 295. What do we mean by the Federal Theology? 296. Name the principal representatives of the Federal Theology? 297. Name the four great theologians of the Church of England during the first half of the 17th century. 298. Name some of the great theologians of the Church of England who flourished during the latter half of the 17th century. 299. Name some of the great Puritan theologians of this period. 300. Describe the movement known as Pietism. 301. Give a brief account of Spener. 302. Of Freylinghausen. 303. Of Rambach. 304. Of Joachim Lange. 305. Of Bengel. 306. Of Oetinger. 307. Of Buddeus. 308. Of Walch. 309. Of Mosheim. 310. Of Ernesti. 311. Of Michælis. 312. Of Semler. 313. What was the tendency of Spinoza's philosophy? 314. Of that of

Leibnitz? 315. Of that of Wolff? 316. Name some of the great theologians of the Church of England who flourished in the latter part of the 18th century? 317. What three denominations originated in the 18th century? 318. Name their principal leaders. 319. Give a brief account of Jonathan Edwards. 320. What is meant by the "New England Theology?"

§ 20. *The Dogmatics of Rationalism and Supranaturalism.* 321. Define Deism. 322. Name some of the leading Deists of England. 323. Name some of the principal leaders of infidelity in France. 324. In Germany. 325. Give a brief sketch of the writings of Kant. 326. Define Vulgar Rationalism. 327. Who was the chief dogmatician of Rationalism? 328. Who was its most successful opponent? 329. Define Supranaturalism. 330. Name some of the principal Dogmaticians of Supranaturalism. 331. Give a brief account of Beck.

§ 21. *The Dogmatics of the Most Recent Time.* 332. What is the tendency of the dogmatics of the most recent time? 333. What was the tendency of the philosophy of Fichte? 334. Of Schelling? 335. Of Hegel? 336. Give a brief account of the theology of Daub. 337. Of Marheineke. 338. Of Strauss. 339. Of Biedermann. 340. What is meant by the theology of Emotion? 341. Give a brief account of the influence of Schleiermacher. 342. Name some of his most prominent pupils. 343. Give a brief account of Hase. 344. Of Rothe. 345. Of Lange. 346. Of Dorner. 347. Of Ebrard. 348. Of Ritschl. 349. What do you know of Hase's *Hutterus redivivus?* 350. Give a brief account of Heinrich Schmid's great work. 351. Of Martensen and his Dogmatics. 352. Of Thomasius and his work. 353. Of Philippi and his work. 354. Of Vilmar and his work. 355. Of Frank and his three great works. 356. Of Lu-

thardt and his Compendium. 357. Review the analysis of Luthardt. 358. Name some of the prominent Dogmaticians of Sweden. 359. Of Norway. 360. Give a brief account of the two most prominent Lutheran Dogmaticians of the 19th century in the United States. 361. Name two dogmaticians representing German Reformed Theology. 362. What type is represented by Van Oosterzee? 363. Name some of the principal writers on Dogmatics in the Church of England. 364. Name two works which represent the theology of the Congregationalists. 365. Name three great theologians of the Presbyterian Church. 366. Name some theologians of the Baptist Church. 367. Name the most prominent dogmaticians of the Methodist Church. 368. Name some of the dogmaticians of the Roman Catholic Church.

INDEX.

Abelard, 19, 60, 176—77
Agricola, 116
Alberti, 230 *note*
Albertus Magnus, 180
Alexander of Hales, 180
Alexandria, school of, 151—54; new school of, 155—60
Allegorical sense of Scripture, 96
Alsted, 217
Ambrose, 165
Ammon, 248
Amphilochius, 87
Amyraldism, 227
Amyraut, 227
Analogy of faith, an inspired means of interpretation, 95
Ancient Church, dogmatics of, 149—72
Andreæ, 228
Anselm of Canterbury, 174—75
Antecedent articles of faith, 131
Ante-Nicene Fathers, 150 *note*
Anthropologia, analysis of topics, 144
Antilegomena, 91
Antiochus Epiphanes, 89
Anton, Paul, 230 *note*, 232
Aprocryphal Books, of O. T., 89
Apollos, 23
Apologetics, 48
Apologists, 150
Apology of Augsburg Confession, 75, 80; history of its origin, 122—23
Apostles' Creed, history of its origin, 112—13
Apostolic Fathers, 150; best edition of, 150 *note*
Aquinas, 181—83
Archetypal theology, 19
Aretius, 201
Arianism, 156
Aristotle, 173
Arndt, 204
Arnold, 232
Articles of faith, pure and unmixed, 129—30; fundamental and non-fundamental, 131—36; of General Council of America, 137—39
Assurance of salvation, 80
Athanasian Creed, history of its origin, 115—16
Athanasius, theology of, 155—56
Atheism, 51
Athenagoras, 150 and *note*
Atonement, 146, 218—19
Auberlen, 234 *note*
Augsburg, Diet of, 117
Augsburg Confession, 73, 75, 77; history of its origin, 116—22; composition of, 116; contents of, 117—18
Augustine, 27, 40, 166—69
Authority of Confessions, 102—5

Baader, 233
Bacon, Roger, 185
Bahrdt, 243
Baier, definition of religion, 44; on natural theology, 52; theology of, 212
Baltzer, 165 *note*
Baptismal Confessions, 113
Baptists, recent dogmaticians of, 272
Barnabas, 150
Basil the Great, 155, 157
Baumgarten-Crusius, 35
Baumgarten, Sigmund Jacob, 239
Baur, on difference between Lutheran and Reformed doctrine, 78
Baxter, 222, 225
Beaven, 161 *note*
Beck, on definition of religion,

40, 45; sketch of, 250
Bengel, 233
Benson, 164 *note*
Bergen Formula, 129
Bernhard of Clairvaux, 177—78
Beveridge, 222, 224
Bible, normative authority of, 72, 78—79, 87—90
Biblical theology, how related to dogmatics, 38
Biedermann, 255
Biel, Gabriel, 187
Bindemann, on Augustine, 166 *note;* 167
Bindseil, 192 *note*
Björling, dogmatics of, 267
Bleek, 87 *note*, 90 *note*
Blunt, 270
Boehme, 51, 253
Boethius, 171—72
Bolingbroke, deism of, 240
Bonaventura, 183
Boniface VIII., 59
Book of Concord, 74—78, 116, 126—29
Boston, Thomas, 222, 226
Breithaupt, 230, 232
Brenz, 116
Bretschneider, 248
Bring, dogmatics of, 268
Browne, 270
Buddeus, on religion, 45; on John Gerhard, 210; sketch of, 235
Buel, 270
Bull, George, 222, 223
Bullinger, 200
Bungener, 199
Bunyan, 222, 225
Burk, 233
Burmann, 220, 221
Burnet, Gilbert, 222, 224

Cairns, 241
Calixtus, 32; his syncretism, 203, 205—6, 211
Calovius, on the use of philosophy, 29; on interpretation of Scripture, 96; theology of, 206, 214
Calvin, 199—200
Calvinism, 199—200
Cameron, John, 227
Canon, of the O. T., 87—90; of the N. T., 90—92
Carpzov, 230 *note*
Caspari, 114 *note*
Catechisms of Luther, their origin, 126
Catholicism, Roman, 56—61
Charnock, 222, 225
Charteris, 90 *note*
Chemnitz, on the Canon, 92, 93; relation to the Formula of Concord, 128, 129; theology of, 196
Chevallier, 224 *note*
Chillingworth, 223, 226
Christ, doctrine of person of (analysis of topics), 145—46; work of (analysis of topics), 146
Christlieb, on faith, 28; 170
Christianity, essence of, 53—55; relation to heathenism and Judaism, 53; historical forms of, 55; the true religion, 56; Apostolic, 64
Christologia, analysis of topics, 145—46
Church, on Anselm, 174 *note*
Church, doctrine of the, Roman, 57—59; Lutheran, 61—62, 67—76, 137—39; analyzed, 148
Church of England, dogmatics of, 222—27, 240, 270—71
Chytraeus, 127, 128
Cicero, 34; on universality of religion, 39
Claims of theology, 23—30
Clarke, Samuel, 223, 227, 240
Clement of Alexandria, 151—52
Clement of Rome, 150 *note*
Cocceius, 220
Collins, deism of, 242
Communion in one kind, 61
Concord, *see* Book of Concord
Confessional dogmatics of recent times, 264—74
Confessionalism, Plitt on, 105—9
Confessions of the Church, 99—140; necessity of, 100; authority of, 101; subscription to, 104; fidelity to, 109; sufficiency of,

110; history of, 112—29; Lutheran Church in U. S. faithful to, 137—39
Congregationalism, dogmatics of recent, 271
Consciousness of faith, 140
Consequent articles of faith, 131
Constituent articles of faith, 131
Cotton, John, 222, 226
Council, General, of Evangelical Lutheran Church, 137—40; its principles of faith, 138—39
Cox, 152 *note*, 156 *note*
Crippen, 151 *note*
Crusius, 233
Cudworth, Ralph, 223, 226
Curcellaeus, 219
Cutts, 166 *note*
Cyprian, 164
Cyril of Alexandria, 159
Cyril of Jerusalem, 159

D'Ailly, Peter, 186
D'Alembert, 243
Dagg, 273
Daniel, canonicity of, 89
Dannhauer, 213
Daub, 254
Deism, 49, 241—43
Delft, Synod of, 220
Delitzsch, 178 *note*, 234 *note*
Descartes, 220, 238
Deutsche Theologia, 188
Deutschmann opposes Spener, 230
De Wette, 256
Dexter, 226 *note*
Diderot, 243
Didymus the Blind, 155, 159
Dilthey, 256 *note*
Doederlein, 245
Dogma, definition of, 33
Dogmatics, relation to ethics, 32, 38; definition of, 33—37; formation of a system of, 83—98; material principle of, 83—84; formal principle of, 84—86; churchly character of, 99; analysis of a system of, 141—49; history of, 149—274; literature of, 274—77
Donaldson, 150 *note*
Dorner, on definition of dogmatics, 36; on Reformed Protestantism, 69; on material principle of Lutheranism, 71—72; on Christian experience, 82; works of, 82 *note*, 151 *note;* on Augustine, 166; as a theologian, 261
Driver, 87 *note*
Duncker, 161 *note*
Duns Scotus, 184
Durand, 185
Dyer, 199 *note*

Eales, 177 *note*
Ebrard, 262
Ecclesiologia, analyzed, 148
Eckhart, Meister, 187
Edwards, Jonathan, 241
Ectypal theology, 19
Emmons, Nathanael, 271
Emotion, theology of, 255—59
Emotional in religion, 44
Episcopalians, 222—24, 240, 270
Ernesti, 236
Eschatologia, analyzed, 149
Ethics, relation to dogmatics, 32
Evidences of Christianity, 48
Examination questions, 278—89
Exegetical theology, analysis of, 31
Experience, 21, 22

Fairbairn, 271
Faith, and knowledge, 28, 62; justification by, 72—74; foundation of, 130; articles of, 129—36; consciousness of, 140
Farrar, Adam, 241
Federal theology, 218
Fichte, 252
Fidelity to the Confessions, 109—11
Field, Richard, 222, 223
Filioque, 115
Finney, 271
Flacius, 195
Flatt, 249 *note;* 250
Fletcher, 240
Forbes, 270
Formal Principle of Protestant-

ism, 62; of Lutheranism, 74; of Reformed Protestantism, 69 71; of dogmatics, 83—86
Formula of Concord, origin of, 126—29
Francke, 230 *note*
Frank, on definition of dogmatics, 36; work by, 56 *note;* on Christian assurance, 82; on fundamental doctrines, 134—36; work by, 151 *note;* dogmatics of, 266
Freedom, abuses of, 65
Freilinghausen, 231
Fries, 256
Fundamental articles of faith, 129—36; of General Council of America, 137—39

Gass, on Gregory of Nazianzus, 157
Gebhardt, 150
General Council of Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, 137—39
General Synod of Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, 137
Gennadius of Marseilles, 170
Gerhard, John, on faith, 27; on the Canon, 92; on interpretation of Scripture, 95—97; theology of, 209; analysis of *Loci* of, 210
Gerhart, Introduction of, 18 *note;* dogmatics of, 270
German Reformed theology, 217, 269
Gersdorf, 164 *note*
Gerson, John, 186
Gibbons, 273
Gieseler, 151 *note*
Gill, 240
Gillett, 190 *note*
God, doctrine of (analysis of topics), 142—44
Goebel, on distinction between Lutheran and Reformed doctrine, 68
Goldhorn, 164 *note*
Gomarus, 119
Gottheil, 211 *note*
Goulburn, 271
Governmental theory of Atonement, 218
Granfelt, 268
Gregory of Nazianzus, 18, 87, 155, 156
Gregory of Nyssa, 155, 156, 158
Grob, 198 *note*
Grotius, Hugo, 205, 218
Gruner, 245
Guericke, 151 *note*

Hafenreffer, 197
Hagenbach, 151 *note*
Hahn, August, 249
Hahn, Michael, 234
Hampden, 172 *note*
Hardwick, 151 *note*, 189 *note*
Harnack, 150 *note*, 151 *note*
Harnoch, 151 *note*
Hartel, 164 *note*
Harvey, 161 *note*
Hase, Karl, opponent of vulgar rationalism, 248; sketch of, 259; *Hutterus redivius*, 264
Hasse, 174 *note*
Hauck, 162 *note*
Hay, 264 *note*
Heathenism and Christianity contrasted, 53
Heerbrand, 197
Hefele, 150 *note*
Hegel, 253
Heider, 253 *note*
Heidegger, 227
Helvetius, 243
Henke, 249
Heppe, on difference between Lutheran and Reformed doctrine, 68; dogmatics of, 269
Herberger, 204
Herbert of Cherbury, on natural religion, 52; philosophy of, 241
Heresies of Rome, 60
Hermann, 263
Herrlinger, 192 *note*, 195 *note*
Herzog, on difference between Lutheran and Reformed doctrine, 69
Hilary of Poitiers, 165

Historical theology, analysis of, 31
Hodge, A. A., 200 *note*
Hodge, Charles, Introduction of, 18 *note;* systematic theology of, 272
Hofmann, on definition of dogmatics, 37
Hollaz, on definition of theology, 20; on aims of theology, 22; on philosophy, 29; on definition of religion, 44; on marks of true religion, 46—47; on the Canon, 92; theology of, 215; analysis of dogmatics of, 215—16
Holtzmann, 90 *note*
Holy Spirit, work of the, 147
Hooker, Richard, 222, 223
Hopkins, Samuel, 271
Horne, 87 *note*
Horsley, 240
Hottinger, 198 *note*
Hovey, 273
Howe, John, 222, 225
Huber, 207
Huelsemann, 213
Hugo of St. Victor, 178
Humanists, 191
Hume, deism of, 242
Hunnius, Aegidius, 207
Hunnius, Nicolaus, 211
Hurst, 241 *note*
Hurter, 273
Huss, 190
Hutter, Leonard, 207—8, 264
Hyperius, 201

Idealism, absolute, 49
Ignatius, 150 *note*
Illumination, period of, 241—45
Incarnation, miracle of, 54, 55
Infallibility, of Roman Church, 59; of the Word of God and the true Church, 78
Inspiration, 55; in Roman Church, 59, 63; doctrine of, 93
Interpretation of Scripture, 93—98; literal, 94; according to analogy of faith, 95; not a multiple sense, 96; principles of, 97
Iowa Synod, 137 *note*
Irenæus, 150, 161
Isidore of Seville, 170

Jackson, 222, 223
Jacobi, on faith, 27; sketch of, 256
Jacobs, on the Apology, 123; dogmatics of, 264 *note;* numerous references
Jacobson, 150 *note*
Jansenists, 67
Jesuits, 67
John of Damascus, 160
Johnson, Gisle, 268
Jonas, 256 *note*
Jonas, Justus, 116, 122, 194 *note*
Jones of Nayland, 240
Josephus, 88
Judaism contrasted with Christianity, 53
Justin Martyr, 90, 150
Justification by faith, the material principle of Lutheranism, 72—74, of dogmatics, 83—84

Kaftan, 263
Kahnis, on definition of theology, 18; of dogmatics, 36; on religion, 45; order of system of, 141; on John Gerhard, 210; dogmatics of, 266
Kant, 245, 252
Kaulich, 178 *note*
Kaye, 162 *note*
Keble, 223 *note*
Keckermann, 217
Keil, 87 *note*
Kirchhofer, 90 *note*
Kirkpatrick, 87 *note*
Kliefoth, 151 *note*
Knapp, 249
Knowledge, 44; and faith, 27—28
Knox, 222
Koellner, on the Smalcald Articles, 126
Koenig, 213
Koerner, 128, 129
Koestlin, 192 *notes*
Krauth, on relation of philosophy to, theology, 28; on marks of true religion, 46—47; on mys-

ticism, 50; on Lutheran Protestantism, 61; on Catholicism, 66—67; on true value of tradition, 68—69; on the necessity of Confessions, 99—100; on the making of Creeds, 103; on the right of private judgment, 104—5; on fidelity to the Confessions, 110—11; on Lutheranism, 111; on Augsburg Confession, 118—20; on Smalcald Articles, 124; on Formula of Concord, 128—9; on the principles of faith of General Council, 139—40; on Chemnitz, 196; as a theologian, 269; numerous notes on his works.
Krogh-Tonning, 268
Krotel, 192 *note*
Kuebel, 262
Kurtz, 150 *note;* on Tertullian, 163; on Scotus Erigena, 170; on Michaelis, 237

Lactantius, 39
Landerer, 90 *note*, 195 *note*
Lange, Joachim, 231
Lange, J. P., 260
Langen, 160 *note*
Last Things, doctrine of, analyzed, 149
Lasson, 187 *note*
Latitudinarians, 223
Laud, William, 222, 223
Lechler, 189—90 *notes*, 241 *note*
Ledderhose, 190 *note*
Leibnitz, 238
Leighton, 222, 224
Lessing, 86, 244, 256
Leydecker, 220
Liddon, 271
Liebner, 178 *note*, 261
Lightfoot, 150 *note*
Limborch, 219
Limitations of theology, 30
Lindberg, 268 *note*
Literature on dogmatics, 274—77
Lipsius, 263
Litton, 271
Loescher, 231
Lombard, Peter, 179—80
Luke, 23
Luthardt, Introduction of, 18 *note;* definition of theology, 18; on relation of philosophy to theology, 30; definition of dogmatics, 33, 35; on essential character of religion, 42; on perversions of Christianity, 49—51; on Catholicism, 58; on difference between Lutheran and Reformed doctrine, 67—68, 71; on material principle of Lutheranism, 72; of dogmatics, 83—84; general division of system of dogmatics, 141—42; analysis of system, 142—49; on Gerhard, 210; as a theologian, 267
Luther, on theological study, 21—22; on Aristotle, 28; on union with Christ, 81; on justification, 83; on the Canon, 92; on perspicuity of Scripture, 94; relation to Augsburg Confession, 118—20; Catechisms of, 126; works, life, theology of, 192 *note*
Lutheran Church in America, 137—39
Lutheran dogmaticians, recent, 264—69
Lutheran Protestantism, differs from Reformed, 68—71; best able to cope with Romanism, 110; material principle of, 72—74; formal principle of, 74—76; historical character of, 76—79
Lutheran theology, of seventeenth century, 207—15
Lutherans, the true Protestants, 62, 110

Maccovius, 219
Man, doctrine of, analyzed, 144—45
Marburg Articles, 116
Maresius, 219
Marheineke, order of system of, 141; sketch of, 254
Martensen, Introduction of, 18 *note;* definition of dogma, 34; of dogmatics, 37; on religion,

41; on Christianity versus heathenism, 53; on essence of Christianity, 54; on Catholicism, 58—59; on difference between Roman Catholicism and Lutheranism, 63—66; between Lutheran and Reformed Protestantism, 70—71; on a dogmatic system, 99; order of system of, 141—42; on Eckhart, 187 *note;* as a dogmatician, 265
Material principle of Protestantism, 61—67; of Lutheranism, 67, 72—74; of Reformed Protestantism, 68—71; of dogmatics, 83—84.
Materialism, 51
Mather, Cotton, 222, 226
Maulbrunn Formula, 128
Mediation, theology of, 259—62
Meditation, 21
Meister Eckhart, 187
Melanchthon, on philosophy, 28; relation to Augsburg Confession, 116—117; edition of *Variata*, 119; prepares Apology, 122; on primacy of the Pope, 125; *Corpus doctrinae* of, 127; vacillations of, 127, 193; dogmatics of, 192—95; *Loci* of, 17, 127, 192—95
Melanchthonian school of dogmatics, 195—97
Mendelssohn, 244
Methodists, recent dogmaticians of, 273
Michaelis, 237
Middle Ages, dogmatics of, 172—91
Miracles, 55
Mixed articles of faith, 130
Mœhler, on Romanism and Protestantism, 57, 59
Morrison, 177
Morus, 245
Mosheim, 151 *note*, 236
Moule, 271
Mueller, 112 *note*
Multiple sense, theory of, 96
Musæus, 52, 205, 207, 211
Musculus, 201
Mysticism, 50, 187—191

Natural religion, 51
Natural theology, 19, 52
Neale, 151 *note*
Neander, 150 *note*, 151 *note*, 162 *note*, 177; on Aquinas, 183
"New England theology," 241, 271
"New Haven theology," 271
New Testament Canon, 90—93
Nicene Creed, history of origin of, 113—14
Nitzsch, Immanuel, on difference between Lutheran and Reformed doctrine, 68; as a theologian, 258
Nitzsch, Fr., 171 *note*
Noack, 171 *note*
Nominalism, 28, 173—76
Non-fundamental articles of faith, 132
Norris, 271

Occam, 186
Oehler, 158 *note*, 162 *note*
Oetinger, 234
Ohio Synod, 137 *note*
Old Testament Canon, 87—90
Olevianus, 201
Oosterzee, Introduction of, 18 *note;* dogmatics of, 270
Oriental Church, dogmatics of, 151—61
Origen, theology of, 152—54
Orthodox dogmatics of seventeenth century, 202—7; dogmaticians of, 207—215
Osiander, 116
Owen, 222, 225

Pajon, 228
Pantænus, 151
Pantheism, 49
Papias, 150
Papin, 228
Paracelsus, 51
Paul, 23, 40
Pearson, 222, 224
Pendleton, 273

Perrone, 59, 273
Person of Christ, analysis of doctrine of, 145—46
Personality of God, analysis of doctrine of, 142—43
Perspicuity of Scripture, 94—95
Peter D'Ailly, 186
Peter Lombard, 179—80
Peter Martyr Vermilius, 200
Pfaff, 235
Pfeiffer, 188 *note*
Philippi, Introduction of, 18 *note;* on faith, 27; definition of dogmatics, 36; on religion, 40; on Christianity, 53; on Christian assurance, 82; on the Apology, 123—24; on fundamental doctrines, 132—34; division of system of, 141; dogmatics of, 266
Philippists, 127
Philosophy, relation to theology, 28—29; of Middle Ages, 172—187; of deism, 241—46; of Descartes, 238; of Kant, 245—46; of Leibnitz, 238; of Wolff, 238; of recent times, 252—55
Pick, 91 *note*
Pictet, 218
Pietism, 203, 228; dogmatics of, 228—32; characterized, 251
Plato, 28
Plitt, on confessionalism, 105—9
Pneumatologia, analyzed, 147
Polanus, 217
Polycarp, 150
Polytheism, 49
Poole, 164, *note*
Pope, William B., 273
Positive religion, 52
Practical theology, analysis of, 32
Prayer, 21
Pre-Reformatory theology, 187—91
Presbyterianism, recent dogmatics of, 272
Preuss, 52 *note*, 60 *note*
Priestley, 240
Primacy of the Pope refuted, 125
Prolegomena, object of, 17—18
Protestant, origin of name, 61; meaning of name, 62—63
Protestantism, contrasted with Romanism, 57—61; essential character of, 61—67; principles of, 62, 67—68; Lutheran, 67—82; Reformed, 68—71
Pure articles of faith, 129—30
Puritans, 225—26
Pusey, 271

Quenstedt, Introduction of, 17; on the use of philosophy, 29; definition of dogmatics, 34; on religion, 44; on marks of true religion, 48; in interpretation of Scripture, 95; on faith, 131; theology of, 214—15

Rambach, 231
Rationalism, dogmatics of, 241—50; history of, 241 *note;* vulgar, 246—48
Raymond, Miner, 273
Realism, 28, 173
Reformation, dogmatics of century of, 191—201; dogmaticians of period, 207—15
Reformed dogmaticians of seventeenth century, 216—220
Reformed Protestantism distinct from Lutheran, 68—71
Reimarus, 244
Reinbeck, 239
Reinhard, 249
Religion, origin of, 41—42; character of, 42—43; definition of, 43—46; truth of, 43, 48; subjective, 43; objective, 46; divisions of, 46—47; perversions of, 49—51; natural, 51—53; positive, 52; revealed, 53; Christianity, the true religion, 56
Rettberg, 164 *note*, 186 *note*
Reuss, 80 *note*
Revealed theology, 20
Revelation, 53
Richard of St. Victor, 179
Richardson, 150 *note*

Rieger, 234
Riggenbach, 232 *note*
Ritschl, 228 *note*, 262
Robertson, 151 *note;* on Bernard of Clairvaux, 178
Roehr, 247
Roger Bacon, 185
Roman Catholic dogmaticians, recent, 273—74
Romanism, contrasted with Protestantism, 56—61; essential character of, 58; criticism of, 59—61
Roos, 234
Roscellinus, 175
Rothe, 36, 260
Rousseau, 242
Rules of faith, 113
Ruysbrœck, 188
Ryland, 162 *note*
Ryle, 87 *note*

Sadler, 271
Salvation, internal assurance of, 80—81
Sartorius, 265
Sarpi, 60
Schaff, on Melanchthon, 125; on Clement of Alexandria, 152; on Origen, 154; on Athanasius, 155; on Basil the Great, 157; on Gregory of Nyssa, 158; on Irenæus, 161; on Cyprian, 164; on Augustine, 166; on Zwingli, 199; *notes* of reference
Schelling, 253
Scherzer, 214
Schleiermacher, on faith and emotion, 27; definition of dogmatics, 35—36; definition of religion, 45; on Protestantism and Romanism, 57; as a theologian, 256
Schmid, H., Introduction of, 17; works of, 151 *note*, 264; references
Schmucker, 249 *note*
Schneckenburger, on difference between Lutheran and Reformed doctrine, 70
Schneider, 185 *note*
Schoeberlein, 262
Scholasticism, character of 172—74; beginnings of, 174—80; highest bloom of, 180—85; decline of, 185—87
Schultz, 263
Schwabach Articles, 116—17
Schweizer, on difference between Lutheran and Reformed doctrine, 69; sketch of, 260, 275
Science of theology, 18—23
Scotus Erigena, 170—71
Scripture, normative authority of, 62, 75, 84
Scriver, 204
Secker, 240
Seiler, 245
Seiss, 191 *note*
Selneccer, 17; theology of, 195
Semisch, on Hilary, 165
Semler, 237
Shedd, Introduction of, 18 *note;* theology a science, 26; dogmatic theology of, 272
Sighart, 180 *note*
Sigwart, 198 *note*
Smalcald Articles, 73, 74, 75; history of origin of, 124—26
Smith, H. B., Introduction of, 18 *note;* dogmatics of, 272
Soteriologia, analysis of topics, 146
South, Robert, 222, 224
Spener, 203 *note*, 229
Spinoza, 238
Spires, Diet of, 61
Spirit, Holy, testimony of, 81; doctrine of work of, 147—48
Spurgeon, 25
Stackhouse, 240
Stähelin, 199 *note*
Stahl, on Reformed Protestantism, 20
Staudlin, 247
Stearns, 56 *note*, 82 *note*, 85 *note*, 271
Steudel, 250
Stier, 89
Stillingfleet, 222, 224
Storr, 249
Storrs, 177, 255

Stoughton, 223 *note*
Strauss, 195
Strigel, 195
Strong, Introduction of, 18 *note;* on theology as a science, 26; systematic theology of, 272
Study, means of theological, 20—22
Subscription to Confessions, 104
Sueskind, 250
Supralapsarians, 219
Supranaturalism, 248—51
Suso, 188
Swedenborg, 51
Symbols, *see* Confessions
Syncretism, 203
Synergism, 193
Synod, General, of Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, 137; United, South, 137
Synodical Conference of Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, 137
Systems of theology, of Luthardt, 141—49; of Philippi, 142; of Melanchthon, 192—95; of Hutter, 208 *note;* of Gerhard, 209 *note;* of Baier, 212 *note;* of Hollaz, 215 *note*

Tatian, 150
Tauler, 188
Taylor, Jeremy, 222, 224
Taylor, Nathaniel, 271
Teller, 245
Tertullian, 162—64
Testimony of Holy Spirit, 81
Theologia Germanica, 188
Theologia, or doctrine of God, analysis of, 142—44
Theology, definition of, 18—20; divisions of, 19, 31—32; revealed, 20; means of study of, 21—22; aims of, 22; claims of, 23—30; limitations of, 30; organism of, 30—32; relation to philosophy, 28—29; natural, 19, 51; system of, 141—49
Theophilus, 150
Thilo, 156 *note*
Tholuck, on Gerhard, 210
Thomas Aquinas, 181—83
Thomasius, 151 *note;* dogmatics of, 172 *note*, 265
Thorn, Conference of, 203 *note*
Tieftrunk, 247
Tillotson, 222, 226
Tindal, deism of, 242
Toellner, 239
Tomline, 240
Toplady, 240
Torgau Articles, 118; Formula, 128
Tradition, unreliableness of, 60; when valid, 68, 71, 78
Trent, Council of, 60, 63, 79, 124
Twesten, on dogmatics, 36; on Protestantism and Romanism, 57; on Christian consciousness, 86; as a theologian, 258
Typical sense of Scripture, 97
Tzschirner, 248

Ueberweg, on Clemens of Alexandria, 152; on Gregory of Nyssa, 158; on Augustine, 166 *note*
Ullman, 156 *note*, 184 *note*, 187 *note*, 190 *note*
Ultramontanism, 67
Unionism, 203 *note*
United Synod South, 137
Ursinus, 201
Usteri, 198 *note*

Van Oosterzee, 18 *note*, 53 *note;* dogmatics of, 270
Van Til, 220, 222
Variata, Augustana, 120
Vaughan, 181 *note*
Vermilius, 200
Victorines, the, 178—79
Vilmar, 18 *note;* dogmatics of, 266
Vincent of Lerins, 169
Voetius, 219
Voigt, 262
Voltaire, 242
Vulgar rationalism, 246—48

Wächter, 233 *note*
Wagenmann, on Occam, 186
Walch, 236

Wallis, 164 *note*
Walter of St. Victor, 179
Walther, on theology of seventeenth century, 205; on Gerhard, 211; on Baier, 212; as a theologian, 269
Warburton, 240
Wardlaw, 271
Waterland, 222, 224, 240
Watson, John, 245 *note*
Watson, Richard, 273
Wegscheider, 247
Weidner, 233 *note*
Weismann, 232
Weiss, 90 *note*
Wendelin, 217
Werner, 181 *note*, 184 *note*
Wesel, 190
Wesley, 240
Wessel, 190
Westcott, 87 *note*, 90 *note*, 271
Western Church, dogmatics of, 161—72
Wette, de, 256
Whitefield, 240
Wiclif, 189
Wilberforce, 271
William of Champeaux, 174, 175
William of Occam, 186
Wiseman, 273
Witsius, 220, 221
Wolfenbuettel Fragments, 244
Wolff, 238
Wolfgang Musculus, 201
Wolleb, 218
Woods, 271
Work of Christ, analysis of doctrine of, 146
Work of Holy Spirit, analysis of doctrine of, 147
Wuertemberg school, 232—34, 250

Zahn, 150 *note*
Zanchi, 202
Zeller, 198 *note*
Zwingli, 198—99

CORRECTIONS.

Before using this volume, misprints should be corrected as follows:

Page 19, line 18, "in himself"; line 3, note, "twelfth century;" 29:5, "characteristic of;" 44:5, "a matter of;" 62:23, "so as to;" 89:27, "have attempted;" 110:21, "in the minority;" 111:10, "theological;" 128:14, 26, "Swabian-Saxon;" 129:7, "Augustus;" 165:4, "alongside;" 167:29, "Christian;" 191:27, "parallel;" 191:28, "serviceable;" 202:31, "fomented;" 222:28, "we;" 234:6, "theologiam;" 242:20, "Rousseau;" 255:25, "Christliche;" 9:27 and 267:14, "succinctness."

On pages 18, 87, 155, 156, the better form is "Gregory of Nazianzus."

230.41P
Weidner, R.F. D.D. W 426
Introd. to dogmatic theology.

230.41P
W426

S0-BYA-239